

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XIII.—No. 52.

OCTOBER, 1937.

JONSON AND THE SPIES

BY MARK ECCLES

I

JONSON told Drummond that "in the tyme of his close Imprissonment under Queen Elisabeth his judges could gett nothing of him to all their demands bot I and No, they placed two damn'd Villans to catch advantage of him, with him, but he was advertised by his Keeper, of the Spies he hath ane Epigrame."¹ Concerning these "two damn'd Villans" Jonson's biographers are content with citing the poem Jonson himself referred to, *Epigram* lix, "On Spies." They seem not to have noticed another epigram which may be relevant, number ci, "Inviting a Friend to Supper." Jonson is writing of the Mermaid's "rich Canary-wine":

Of this we will sup free, but moderately,
And we will haue no *Pooly*, or *Parrot* by;
Nor shall our cups make any guiltie men:
But, at our parting, we will be, as when
We innocently met. No simple word
That shall be utter'd at our mirthfull boord,
Shall make vs sad next morning: or affright
The libertie, that wee'll enioy to night.

No editor has offered a satisfactory explanation of the names "Pooly" and "Parrot."²

¹ C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, 1 (1925), p. 139.

² In *The Poems of Robert Greene, Christopher Marlowe, and Ben Jonson* (1878), p. 263 n., Robert Bell interprets the line as a contemptuous reference to Henry Parrot, "coupled with the name of Pooly, another obscure poetaster" (presumably the "M. Yloop" in *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*, 1576). Bernard H. Newdigate in *The Poems of Ben Jonson* (Oxford, 1936), p. 409, also finds a possible allusion to Henry Parrot, but cannot account for "Pooly" except as "suggesting Poll-Parrot." This seems far-fetched; if Jonson had meant "Poll" he would have written "Poll," as he did in *Epigram* lxxi.

"Pooley" is clearly Robert Poley (pronounced "Pooley" and often so written), who betrayed Babington and was present when Marlowe was stabbed at Deptford—after supper, as Jonson may have remembered. Poley was the very type of the treacherous informer who could masquerade as boon companion. It may be as such that Jonson names him, or he may have been actually one of the two sent to draw Jonson into danger. Miss Seaton concludes, from ciphers used by Poley in 1597, that "up to 1597 he was as well trusted and as busily employed as ever before."¹ A letter of his written March 5, 1596/7, is dated from "Hogesden," where Jonson the year after fought Gabriel Spencer. Poley was not employed as a Government messenger between March 1596/7 and December 1598,² and consequently would have had plenty of leisure to spy on Jonson. He carried messages for the last time in 1601, and was still alive in 1602,³ but by this time, in the words of Jonson's epigram, he had burnt himself down to the snuff and Cecil had thrown him away—"End fair enough."

Jonson was never afraid to name his enemies, and, in *Epigram* ci, he has almost certainly named one, if not both, of the two spies who tried to trap him. For Parrot is recorded as an informer against a prisoner in Newgate not very much later than the time of Jonson's first imprisonment. A petition to Sir Robert Cecil, dated "1598" by the Record Office officials,⁴ presents the complaint of George Barkworth, prisoner in Newgate for six months "as supposed to be a Semynarye preist, w^h he protests he is not." After being examined nine several times before the Lord Chief Justice and others, and brought to the Sessions bar at Newgate four times, three weeks earlier he had petitioned Cecil, in respect of his health, to be removed to Bridewell "as to a place of more open ayre." Cecil had written Mr. Waad and the other high commissioners for his removal. "But," says Barkworth,

by y^e practyze of one *Parrat*, the warrant was altered, and the peticoner daytayed in Newgate some .10. daies longer, the said *Parrat* comeinge vnto him euery daye and practizinge for gayne or otherwise threateninge his further trouble; the *Suppliant* gaue him him xl? and was then

¹ Ethel Seaton, "Robert Poley's Ciphers," *R.E.S.*, vii (1931), p. 137.

² Eugénie de Kalb, "Robert Poley's Movements as a Messenger of the Court, 1588 to 1601," *R.E.S.*, ix (1933), pp. 13-18.

³ E. K. Chambers in *M.L.R.*, xxi (1926), p. 85.

⁴ S.P. 12/269/32; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1598-1601*, pp. 140-141. The true date is probably 1600 or 1600/1.

presentlie removed; the warrant nameinge him to be a Semynary preiste, wh he refused to accept of . . . but he was taken away against his will, and brought to *Brydewell*, where he had the libertie of the prison for two dayes: In all wh time the said Parratt sollicyted him for more money, affirminge that by his meanes he was remoued, and vnles he would giue him viij^{li} more he would cause him to be shutt vp close prisoner.

The "close Imprissonment" of which Jonson spoke to Drummond meant more than the ordinary imprisonment which he underwent at Newgate. It may be illustrated by what happened to Barkworth when he refused to bribe Parrat further: he "was instantly closed vp in the wurst rometh in y^e house where he remayneth comfortles vnles by yo^r ho: he may be releiued, protestinge he is not the man he is supposed for, of beinge a preist." Barkworth ends by praying Cecil's warrant to the Keeper of Bridewell that he may have the liberty of the house, as he had in Newgate. Barkworth seems to have been actually Mark Barkworth, a Benedictine who was hanged at Tyburn on February 27, 1600/1 (*D.N.B.*). At the Old Bailey Barkworth "refused to be put upon trial by the jury, giving as a reason that he knew that upon the jury there were certain persons named Parratt, Ingleby, and Singleton ready to swear he was a priest"; and on the gallows he prayed for "Mr. Waade, Ingleby, Parrat, and Singleton, who were the prosecutors of his death."¹

The informer was evidently the "Parrot" of Jonson's "Inviting a Friend to Supper," and one would like to know whether he was William Parrat, who wrote the amusing "Sonnet upon the pittiful burneing of the Globe playhouse in London,"² or Henry Parrot, the epigrammatist.³ Nothing whatever is known of Henry Parrot's life, but he may be the Henry Parrot whom I have come across in the Hustings Rolls at the Guildhall. On October 2, 1601, John Chapman of High Holborn, gent., and his wife Thomasine conveyed to her brother Roger Taylor of London, gent., her life-estate in the house late in the tenure of Henry Gresham and now of Henry Parrot, in "Aldrichgate streete in ye parish of St. Buttolph wthout Aldrichgate." The Chapmans retained their right to the seven

¹ Dom Bede Camm, *A Benedictine Martyr in England* (1897), pp. 117-118, 123, and *Nine Martyr Monks* (1931), pp. 25-26, 30, 35, 43-44. Dom Bede conjectures that the informer was Stephen Parott, who had studied at Westminster School, at Douai, and at the English College at Valladolid, but had been dismissed from the last in 1590 "justas ob causas" (cf. Edwin Henson, *Registers of the English College at Valladolid*, Catholic Record Society, xxx, 1930, pp. 36, 53).

² E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (1923), II. 420.

³ On whose works see Margaret C. Pitman, "The Epigrams of Henry Peacham and Henry Parrot," *M.L.R.*, xxix (1934), pp. 129-136.

pounds yearly rent from Henry Parrot, according to his lease dated May 17, 1600, for forty years from the following Christmas.¹ When Roger Taylor and his wife Anne conveyed the house on May 8, 1602, to William Willford of Enfield, it is described as near Trinity Hall and as still in the tenure of Henry Parrot.²

One of the earliest references to *Volpone* (not noticed in *The Jonson Allusion-Book*) was made by Henry Parrot in his collection of epigrams called *The Mous-Trap*, published in 1606. Epigram 97 runs as follows :

Magus would needs forsooth this other day,
Vpon an idle humor see a play :
When asking him at dore, that held the box,
What might you call the play ? (quoth he) the Fox
In goes my Gen-man (who could iudge of wit)
And being asked how he liked it :
Said all was ill, both Fox and him that playd it,
But was not he thinke you a Goose that said it ?

Jonson himself has an epigram, number lxxi, "On Court Parrot":

To pluck down mine, *Poll* sets up new wits still ;
Still 'tis his luck to praise me 'gainst his will.

The person satirized is most naturally taken to be some envious courtier ; but the epigram is not inapplicable to Henry Parrot. The verses on *Magus* are rather favourable to Jonson than not, since they call his critic a goose. The author might, therefore, be said to have praised Jonson against his will. For he showed his hostility by calling Jonson a goose in an epigram in *Laquei Ridiculosi, or Springes for Woodcocks* (1613),³ beginning, "Put off thy Buskins (*Sophocles* the great,) And Morter tread with thy disdained shancks." In *The Mastive, or Young-Whelp of the Olde-Dogge* (1615) he has an epigram under the motto, "*Vt nasus notus*" :⁴

Olde *Publius Naso* hath compos'd a Play,
Of such a plot, as few or none that view it
But will avouch he writes not every day,
Nor as the times of late (I would you knew it)
The best in London payes for his inuention,
Knowne to be simply such as needes no mention.

¹ *Hustings Roll* 281 (19).

² *Hustings Roll* 281 (24).

³ Book I, no. 163 ; J. F. Bradley and J. Q. Adams, *The Jonson Allusion-Book* (1922), pp. 84-85.

⁴ Sig. E 1^v. In *Laquei Ridiculosi*, Book I, no. 130, Parrot uses the motto "*Tam notus vt nasus*." Besides repeating his own verses in various books Parrot was a wholesale plagiarist from Sir John Harington and others. His crimes are described by F. B. Williams, Jr., in "Henry Parrot's Stolen Feathers," a forthcoming article in *P.M.L.A.*

This sounds as though it were aimed at Jonson, who in *The Poetaster* had identified himself with "Publius Ovidius the Poet." Parrot describes *The Mastive* as finished long since, though but lately published. Parrot's verses are very poor stuff, and he thoroughly deserved any scorn that Jonson may have thrown his way.

II

Jonson's "close Imprissonment under Queen Elisabeth" has been assumed by his biographers to have been his detention in Newgate for the manslaughter of Gabriel Spencer, from September 22 until October 6, 1598.¹ A fresh study of the evidence, however, has convinced me that it was his imprisonment in the Marshalsea for his part in *The Isle of Dogs*, from early in August until October 8, 1597. Sir Edmund Chambers is the one writer who has recognized this,² but his interpretation has been ignored in the various lives of Jonson published since 1923. Jonson remained in Newgate for two weeks; he was in the Marshalsea for about two months. The Middlesex justices had no reason to set spies to attempt "to inveigle him into an admission of the capital charge,"³ nor is it any more likely that they should so soon have learned "that in the course of his brief confinement he had suddenly adopted the Catholic faith."⁴ The Privy Council, on the other hand, was accustomed to employ *agents provocateurs*. The "demands" which Jonson mentions are specified in the Council's letter of August 15, 1597:⁵ what had become of the other writers or actors of *The Isle of Dogs*, what copies of the play the imprisoned actors had given forth and to whom, and "soch other pointes as you shall thincke meete to be demaunded of them, wherein you shall require them to deale trulie as they will looke to receave anie favor." Jonson's answering only Aye and No to such questions was obviously not very helpful. In the eyes of the Privy Councillors *The Isle of Dogs* was a much more serious affair than the killing of one actor by another. The Council described the play as "contanyng very seditious &

¹ The Michaelmas Gaol Delivery for Middlesex was regularly held on the first Friday in October, which in 1598 was October 6. The day on which Jonson killed Spencer was also Friday, so that "on a Friday fil al this meschaunce," as the Nun's Priest laments.

² *The Elizabethan Stage* (1923), III. 353.

³ C. H. Herford, *The Mermaid Series, Ben Jonson*, I. xx.

⁴ Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, I. 19.

⁵ *Ibid.*, I. 217-218.

sclandrous matter," and the players as guilty of "Leude and mutynous behaviour."

The men whom Jonson calls his "judges" were the five examiners authorized by the Council to question the players and to peruse Nashe's papers. Three of the five, Richard Topcliffe, Thomas Fowler, and Richard Skevington, were commissioned on December 1 to examine Thomas Travers in Bridewell for stealing a standish of Queen Elizabeth's, and if necessary to use the torture of the manacles.¹ Topcliffe, Skevington, and the Recorder of London had been authorized to use the same torture the year before in examining eighty "Egipcians and wanderers."² Fowler and Skevington were among the Middlesex justices ordered on July 28, 1597, because of the provocation given by *The Isle of Dogs*, to see that the Theatre and the Curtain were plucked down.³ Both justices lived in the country north of London, where Jonson set the scene of *A Tale of a Tub*, with its Squire Tub of Totten Court and Justice Richard Preamble of Marylebone. Skevington, who lived at Hornsey, died in 1598.⁴ Fowler, lord of the manor of Barnsbury in Islington, in 1603 became Sir Thomas Fowler and served as foreman of the jury of knights that condemned Raleigh.⁵ His son Edmund was for a time Clerk Comptroller of the Tents and Revels.⁶ Jonson's other two examiners were Dr. Giles Fletcher, Remembrancer of London and author of the sonnet-sequence *Licia* and *Of the Russe Commonwealth*, and "m^r Wilbraham," possibly Roger Wilbraham, Solicitor-General of Ireland, who on August 9 had written Burghley from Nantwich offering to attend him at court.⁷

As for the spies, Robert Poley had been imprisoned in the Marshalsea during 1583 and 1584, half the time close prisoner and half the time with "the liberty of the house." In 1588 he had managed to have William Yeomans committed to the Marshalsea,⁸ and in 1596 he urged the Lord Chamberlain "to remember

¹ *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, N.S., xxviii. 165.

² *Ibid.*, xxvi. 325.

³ *Ibid.*, xxviii. 313-314.

⁴ P.C.C., 3 Lewyn; *Middlesex Pedigrees*, Harleian Society, LXV (1914), p. 97.

⁵ *Middlesex Pedigrees*, p. 29; John Nelson, *The History, Topography, and Antiquities of the Parish of St. Mary Islington* (1811), pp. 260-262, 294, 355; Edward Edwards, *The Life of Sir Walter Raleigh* (1868), I. 404.

⁶ Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, I. 100.

⁷ *Calendar of State Papers, Relating to Ireland, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1596-1597*, p. 371. "The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham" has been published in *The Camden Miscellany*, x (1902).

⁸ F. S. Boas, *Marlowe and his Circle* (1929), pp. 32, 55.

poor Udall in the Marshalsea" (William Udall).¹ The officer of the Marshalsea who testified against Poley in 1588/9, Richard Edy, is called "porter of the Marshalsea" in 1596, deputy keeper in 1600, and keeper in 1601.² He may have been the keeper who warned Jonson of the spies (being well acquainted with Poley's subtlety), or it may have been one of the other officers, such as Thomas Jackson, who in 1598 lent Barnabe Barnes money before his escape from the Marshalsea, and in 1600/1 was bound over to answer concerning the escape of George Kendall.³

One of Jonson's fellow-prisoners in the Marshalsea during the earlier part of August 1597 was Thomas Carleton of Askerton, land serjeant of Gilsland, charged with being privy to the breaking of Carlisle Castle and the rescue of "Kynmouth" by Buccleuch, Walter Scott of Harden, and their followers.⁴ Carleton had been Constable of the Castle until Lord Scrope discharged him. Accused of seeking revenge, he was indicted of march treason and sent up to the Council. The chief witness against him, Andrew Graeme, was in turn sent to the Marshalsea on September 20 to be kept close prisoner.⁵ Jonson, who remembered his Border ancestry and his grandfather from Carlisle, would naturally be interested in the exploit at Carlisle Castle.

III

Jonson was "appealed to the fields" in 1598 by his former fellow in Pembroke's company, Gabriel Spencer, who had been imprisoned with him the year before in the Marshalsea. Though his opponent's sword may have been ten inches longer than his, as he later boasted to Drummond, Jonson had the advantage both in age and in experience. He was about twenty-six; he had fought in the wars; and he had vanquished in single combat a soldier of the strongest army in Christendom. Gabriel Spencer had killed a

¹ *Calendar of the MSS . . . at Hatfield*, vi (1895), p. 424; cf. p. 277 and E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare* (1930), II, 166-167.

² S.P. 12/252/94; *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, N.S., xxx, 783; xxxii, 192. He signed his name "Ede," but it was usually written by others "Edy," "Edey," showing the pronunciation.

³ *Thomas Lodge and Other Elizabethans* (1933), ed. C. J. Sisson, pp. 186, 217.

⁴ Cf. *Kinmont Willie* in Scott's *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* (1802), I, 111-136. The land serjeant is a chief figure in the ballad of *Hobbie Noble* (I, 164-176).

⁵ *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, N.S., xxvii, 294, 344; xxviii, 6; xxix, 211 (allowance for Graeme's expenses to Cuthbert Gerrard, Keeper of the Marshalsea). In 1598 Carleton was shot "cleane throw the hed so that he fell dead at thinstant and never spake word" (Joseph Bain, *The Border Papers*, II, 546-547).

man two years before, but with a candlestick instead of a sword; and his victim, James Feake, was merely the son of a London goldsmith.¹ Spencer was then only twenty, and he was only twenty-two when Jonson wrote "finis" to his career; for I find that "Gaberyll son of Gaberyll Spencer" was christened at Christ Church, Newgate, on April 8, 1576.² Gabriel Spencer and Anne Tatnall had been married at Christ Church on November 5, 1571, and "Ellyn dau. of Gaberell Spencer, pewterer" had been christened on October 31, 1574.³ Like Jonson, Spencer was born a month after his father's death; for "Gabrell Spencer" was buried at Christ Church on March 14, 1575/6,⁴ and administration was granted on March 16 to his widow Ellen (evidently a second wife), the actor's mother.⁵

Spencer is generally identified with the "Gabriel" whose name the Folio text of *3 Henry VI* took over from the prompt-copy in a stage direction after I. ii. 47: "Enter Gabriel" instead of "Enter a Messenger." Since the messenger speaks only four lines, the part is a likely one for a boy of sixteen or seventeen, as Spencer was in 1592 or 1593. It is not surprising that he does not appear in the cast of *The Seven Deadly Sins* about 1590. What is known of his career connects him only with Pembroke's Men until 1597, when he left Francis Langley and the Swan for Henslowe. He must have been an actor of great promise to have died so young and yet to be remembered among famous players of Elizabeth's reign by Thomas Heywood in *The Apology for Actors* (1612).

IV

It was in Newgate, after the affair with Spencer, that Jonson first became a Catholic: "then took he his Religion by trust of a

¹ See the pedigree in H. W. Foote, *Robert Feke, Colonial Portrait Painter* (1930), and the authorities cited in Appendix B. Spencer's victim was probably the son of James Feake and Parnell Ward, married in 1562 (*Allegations for Marriage Licences Issued by the Bishop of London, 1520 to 1610*, Harleian Society, xxv [1887], p. 25). He is mentioned in the will of his mother Parnell Feake of St. John Zachary in 1593, and in that of his uncle William of Lombard Street, 1595, who had secured a grant of arms in 1592 (H. F. Waters, *Genealogical Gleanings in England* [1901], i. 788 f.; *Grantees of Arms*, Harleian Society, lxvi [1915], p. 87).

² *The Registers of Christ Church, Newgate*, Harleian Society Registers, xxi (1895), p. 26.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 198, 24. In the printed register marriages for this period are wrongly postdated by a year.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 273, correcting the error of the printed register, which dates burials for this period two years later than in the original register. The administration record gives the true date, 1575/6.

⁵ *Administrations in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury* (1912), ed. R. M. Glencross, II. 66.

priest who Visited him in Prisson. thereafter he was 12 yeares a Papist."¹ During all these twelve years the only known proceedings against him for his religion (except Northampton's accusation of "popperie" before the Privy Council) took place in 1605/6. After the discovery of the Gunpowder Plot a wave of fear went over England and even the most harmless Catholics were inevitably under suspicion. Jonson had promptly shown his loyalty by endeavouring to secure information about the plot for Salisbury and the Council,² but his connection with Salisbury's intelligence service may not have been known to the lesser authorities. In any case he was still a Catholic, and the churchwardens and "sworn men" of his parish, St. Anne, Blackfriars, presented Jonson and his wife for absenting themselves from the communion "ever since the kinge Came in," adding, "he is a poett and is by fame a seducer of youthe to y^e popishe Religion."³

On January 9, 1605/6, the day before his presentment in the Consistory Court, Jonson was proclaimed at the Old Bailey as a recusant. The indictment against him and nineteen others is preserved at the Guildhall among the files of the Sessions of Gaol Delivery of Newgate for London.⁴ I need not give the list of names in full, for it has now been printed by Dom Hugh Bowler in his excellent *London Sessions Records, 1605-1685*.⁵ Jonson's name stands eighth in the list of twenty, following the name of Henry Dorrell of St. Anne, Blackfriars, esquire, a noted Sussex recusant who was sent to Newgate in 1610 for refusing to take the oath of allegiance. With the less important names omitted, the indictment runs as follows:

London ss Juratores pro Domino Rege presentant quod . . . Beniaminus Johnson nuper⁶ de *predicta* parochia sancte Anne infra *predictum* precinctum nuper fratrum predicatorum iamdudum dissolutorum vulgo vocatum le Blackfryers London *predicti* in Warda de farringdon infra London *predictum* *generosus*, . . . Thomas Lodge de parochia Ecclesie Christi in *predicta* Warda de farringdon infra London *predictum* in medecinis Doctor, . . . Martin Pierson de parochia sancti

¹ *Conversations with Drummond*, section 13.

² Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, I. 202-203.

³ *Ibid.*, 220.

⁴ Guildhall Records Office, Sessions Files for January 9, 1605/6, no. 65.

⁵ Catholic Record Society, xxxiv (1934), pp. 6-8; cf. p. xlv.

⁶ "Nuper" does not imply that Jonson had left Blackfriars (he was there still in June and in the following year). It was put in "to avoid defective statement and to forestall possible lines of defence" (Bowler, p. xxxiii).

Olavi in Silverstrete in Warda de Creplegate london *predicti* musicion Edmund Bolton de parochia sancti Thome Appostoli in Warda de Vinetria london *predicti* generosus . . . qui quinto die octobris Anno regni Domini nostri Jacobi Dei gratia Anglie francie et Hibernie Regis fidei Defensoris &c', Tertio ac Scotie xxxixº fuerunt et eorum quilibet fuit etatis sexdecim annorum et vltra non accesserunt anglice did not repaire nec eorum aliquis accessit ecclesijs suis parochialibus *predictis* nec alicui alie ecclesie capelle aut vsuali loco communis precationis, et ibidem fuerunt aut aliquis eorum fuit tempore communis precationis ad aliquod tempus infra tres menses proxime sequentes dictum quintum diem octobris annis tertio et tricesimo nono supradictis, sed abstinuerunt ab eisdem Anglice have forborne the same a *predicto* quarto¹ die octobris Annis tertio et tricesimo nono supradictis per *predictum* spacium *predictorum* trium mensium extunc proxime sequentium contra tenorem cuiusdam statuti apud Westmonasterium in Comitatu Middlesex Anno regni Domine Elizabethæ nuper Regine Anglie primo pro vni-formitate communis precationis et contra formam Statuti apud Westmonasterium in Comitatu Middlesex Anno regni dicte Domine Elizabethæ nuper Regine Anglie vicesimo tertio in huiusmodi casu editi et provisi in dicti Domini Regis nunc et legum suarum contemptu manifesto Ac contra pacem dicti Domini Regis nunc coronam et dignitatem suas. &c'.

This bill was presented at the Sessions of the Peace held at the Guildhall on January 7. The grand jury² was ordered to bring in a verdict at the Old Bailey at eight in the morning of Thursday, January 9. The jury found the indictment "billa vera," and accordingly, at the Sessions of Gaol Delivery of Newgate on January 9, all twenty were proclaimed by the Court Crier according to the form of the statute.

According to the statute of 29 Elizabeth, cap. 6, a proclaimed recusant was regarded as convicted if he did not make appearance of record at the next Sessions. Jonson was convicted by default as were all the others indicted with him except Edward Wilton, who was discharged "quia protulit sertificacionem de conformitate." Each convicted recusant became liable to a fine of twenty pounds

¹ Read *quinto*.

² The foreman was "Simo Sedgwick," a goldsmith who signed himself "Symeon Sedgwick" (*Journal* 29, f. 90v). Sedgwick, Augustine Soda, and five more jurors were of Langbourn ward; the other eight were of Farringdon Within, in which Jonson and Lodge were living. The justices of Gaol Delivery were headed by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, the Bishop of London, Sir William Waad, Sir Thomas Fowler, Sir Henry Mountagu, and Nicholas Fuller.

for every month during which he forbore to come to church—not only the months specified in the indictment, but each month of recusancy thereafter. If the fine was not paid, the Crown had the right to seize all the recusant's goods and two-thirds of his lands. Fines and forfeitures were collected by the Exchequer, acting upon the list of names sent up by the Clerk of the Peace, who in London was the Town Clerk (at this time William Sebright).¹ But the statute was not consistently enforced, and no theories of special influence are required to explain the fact that Jonson and the rest do not appear on the Recusant Rolls of the Exchequer and seem to have suffered no penalty for their conviction. Jonson, indeed, had been employed by the Council in November and had made the mask performed at Court on the Sunday before his indictment, so that he probably could have secured a stay of process; but his taking this course would not have prevented the others indicted with him from appearing on the Recusant Rolls. Why they were not proceeded against can only be conjectured. One reason may have been that the indictment included the name of Elizabeth, wife of John Sotherton, esquire, himself an official of the Exchequer (later, in 1610, Baron of the Exchequer like his father before him).

Jonson's wife was not indicted at the London Sessions, though on January 10 she was presented along with her husband in the ecclesiastical court. Gifford's statement that Jonson married a wife who was "young and a Catholic like himself" is mere assertion. Jonson was not a Catholic at the time of his marriage, as Gifford supposed. The only evidence concerning his wife's religion is, on the one hand, her presentment in the Consistory Court and, on the other, Jonson's reply in her behalf and the probability that she was married and had at least one son baptized in the established Church.

Of the other men indicted with Jonson, Lodge had already been proclaimed as a recusant at the London Sessions of Gaol Delivery on February 15, 1604/5. The fact that he was then described as "Thomas Lodge nuper de parochia ecclesie Christi"² is again

¹ Bowler, pp. xlii-xlv.

² *Ibid.*, p. 3. Lodge left England before March 9, 1605/6, when a letter was written him from London by William Jenison, on whom see Bowler, pp. 33, 58-60, 73, 86, 383-384. For further records of Lodge as a Catholic see N. B. Paradise, *Thomas Lodge* (1931), Chapter III, but note that the appearances of Lodge on the Middlesex Gaol Delivery Rolls (not "Register") should be dated 1611 and 1617, not 1612 and 1618. That Lodge had returned to London by 1610 is proved by another record of the London Sessions, not connected with his religion and therefore not published by Bowler.

evidence that "nuper" was merely formal, and might be put in or left out at will. On the same indictment is found the name of Hugh Holland of the parish of St. Faith, gentleman, who wrote verses to Jonson published in the 1605 quarto of *Sejanus*. He had been a schoolfellow of Jonson at Westminster, and Jonson wrote an ode for his *Pancharis* in 1603. He is best remembered for his sonnet on Shakespeare in the First Folio, and because Coryat names him among the frequenters of the Mermaid. Probably he is the "H. H." who has a sonnet, "To the ternall, and æternall Unitie," just before Jonson's sonnet in *The Passions of the Minde in Generall* (1604) by their fellow-Catholic Thomas Wright. Holland was again proclaimed as a recusant on January 16, 1610/11,¹ and yet again on April 24, 1612, when he was indicted, as the clerk noted on the back of the document, "ex testimonio Anthonij Munday." Munday was also the witness against Thomas Bell of St. Sepulchre, gentleman, indicted February 19, 1611/12.²

The musician indicted with Jonson, Martin Peerson (as his name is usually spelt), is first heard of as composer of the music for a song in Jonson's entertainment at Highgate, "See, see, oh see, who here is come a-maying." Since the entertainment was presented on May Day, 1604, Peerson was obviously not born, as is assumed in the *D.N.B.*, "about 1590."³ In the reign of Charles I he became Master of the Children of St. Paul's, and Almoner.⁴ Peerson's published works were *Private Musicke, or the First Booke of Ayres and Dialogues* (1620) and *Mottects or Grave Chamber Musicke* (1630). I shall have more to say of him elsewhere in connection with the Blackfriars playhouse.

Finally, Edmund Bolton wrote verses for *Volpone* (1607) and may have been the "Ev. B." who has verses before *Sejanus* (1605). He praised "that vital, judicious, and most practicable Language of *Benjamin Jonson's Poems*," and in his selections for a projected British Academy included Jonson and Hugh Holland.⁵ Bolton

¹ Bowler, p. 56, in a list headed by Sir William Wiseman, according to Aubrey a patron of Jonson; he had concealed Fathers Garnet and Gerard at his manor-house of Braddocks near Wimbish, Essex.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 71; for Holland see also pp. 377-378, and J. C. Jeaffreson, *Middlesex County Records*, I (1886), p. 259.

³ Cf. Jeffrey Pulver, *A Biographical Dictionary of Old English Music* (1927), pp. 355-357.

⁴ Cecil S. Emdin in *R.E.S.*, II (1926), pp. 421-422.

⁵ J. F. Bradley and J. Q. Adams, *The Jonson Allusion-Book*, pp. 52, 56, 102, 109.

had a house at Whitefriars Dock in 1610 and 1612,¹ and he was consequently described as of St. Bride's when his wife Margaret was indicted for recusancy in 1615. When she was again indicted in 1617, he was living in St. Sepulchre's.² *The Elements of Armories*, which Bolton published in 1610, contains verses by Holland and "A Letter to the Author, from the learned young gentleman, I. B. of Grace-Dieu in the County of Leicester, Esquier."³ This was Francis Beaumont's brother John, later Sir John, for whose *Bosworth Field* (1629) Jonson wrote laudatory verses. "Johannes Beaumonte nuper de parochia S^{ci} Dunstani in Occidentali" was proclaimed at the Sessions of Gaol Delivery on April 3, 1606, because he had forborne to attend church for six months beginning August 20, 1605.⁴ Having in July 1605 inherited the family estates, he had to pay the penalty for his recusancy: two-thirds of Grace Dieu monastery and the rest of his lands were granted by the King to Sir James Semple, a Scot. John Beaumont secured a licence on January 15, 1609/10, to leave Grace Dieu on business for three months "beyinge a Recusant Convictt, and remayninge consigned to hys house accordinge to the statute in that behalfe provided."⁵ More fortunate than his friend, Jonson was safeguarded from fine and forfeiture both by his lack of worldly estate (a poor recusant naturally yielded no profit to the Exchequer) and by his value to the Court as a writer of masks for the Twelfth Night revels.

¹ Letters to Sir Robert Cotton, Cotton MS. Julius C. III, ff. 28-32.

² Bowler, pp. 90, 98.

³ Printed by Grosart in *The Poems of Sir John Beaumont, Bart.* (1869), pp. xxxvi-xxxvii. Verses by Beaumont "Concerning the Academ of Honor" are printed by Ethel M. Portal, "The Academ Roial of King James I," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1915-1916, p. 193.

⁴ Bowler, p. 14.

⁵ *Miscellanea II*, Catholic Record Society, II (1906), p. 305.

THE LIFE OF CHRISTOPHER SAINT GERMAN

By PEARL HOGREFFE

CHRISTOPHER SAINT GERMAN, contemporary of Sir Thomas More and author of legal and political documents, was important in his day ; but now, to many students of the sixteenth century, he is a mere name or less. Hence, more information about him might be of value ; and my research has recently brought together the biographical details which follow, in brief form.

Saint German was concerned in several property transfers which give clues about his associates. In 1508 John Peytoo was granted license to enfeof John Burdel, Esq., Wm. Boughton, Esq., George Throkmerton, Esq., John Rastall, Christopher Saintgerman, Wm. Coke, John Spenser, Richard, Antony, and Michael Throckmerton and their heirs of much Warwickshire property (*Cal. of Patent Rolls, Hen. VII, v. 11*). A property transaction of 1510 included Will Boughton, Christopher Seyntgerman, Henry Boughton, and Edward Warner (*Letters and Papers, i. 381*). On November 16, 1527, there is recorded a demise by Christopher Seynt German to Wm. Wollyngton, of the manor of Grene, in Alvechurche, Worcester (*Cal. of Ancient Deeds, III. A 4688*).

In his will, which was well known to those who have written about him (P.C.C. 29 Alenger, 1541), Saint German mentioned a cousin, John Blennerhasset, left certain bequests to Sir Henry Grey's family, and mentioned "Maryborne" in Middlesex, Church Lawford (Laleforde), and Bilton in Warwickshire, Catthorpe in Leicester, the church of "Mary Magdalen in fyshstreet," and the church of Shilton beside Coventry, where his parents were buried. John Blennerhasset's will, which has probably not been used for its information about Saint German (P.C.C. 16 Thower, 1532), left money for the churches of "Hampsted," "Sowthell," and "Marybone," and for the repair of highways "betwext Hamsted and Seynt Gyles in the felde" ; he willed a lease of Saint Bartholomew's to Saint German and to Sir Henry Grey ; and he named

"my cosyn Crystofer Seynt Germyn and Sir Harrye Graye knyght" as his executors.

This John Blennerhasset, according to visitations and other family records, was the son of John by his second wife, Jane, daughter of Thomas Tindall, of Hockwold, Norfolk. Though a son by the first wife, Sir Thomas, was the chief heir, John inherited the estate at Southill, Bedford, and died without issue, leaving bequests to the families of his four sisters. One of the four sisters was Anne, wife of Sir Henry Grey, of Wrest, Bedfordshire (Francis Blomefield, *An Essay towards a Top. Hist. of the Co. of Norfolk*, I. 141; II. 180-181; VII. VIII. *passim*; *Visitations of Norfolk* . . . Harl. Soc., v. 32, p. 200; Philip Morant, *Hist. of Essex*, II. 153; *Norfolk Archaeology*, 1872, VII. 79). Another of the four sisters, Jane, married Sir Philip Calthorp. From 1521 to 1527, at least, Sir Philip and his wife were in charge of the household of the Princess Mary (*Letters and Papers*, III, Pt. II, 1437, 1439, 1533, 1673, 2585, iii; IV. 1577, No. 10, 2331, 2972. See v. 166, No. 12, for Calthorp's service on a commission with Sir Thomas More, and II, Pts. I and II, and III, Pt. I for earlier items). By his wife, Margaret Yelverton, Thomas Tindale, Esq., of Hockwold, Norfolk, had three children. His son William, Knight of the Bath, received Scales Manor and was declared heir of the Kingdom of Bohemia, through his great-grandmother, Margaret, who had come to England with Anne of Bohemia. Besides the daughter Jane, who married John Blennerhasset, of Frense, Norfolk, there was a daughter, Anne, who married Henry St. Jermyn (Blomefield, *op. cit.*; Muskett, *Suffolk Manorial Families*, 1894-97, Parts 1-4; *Genealogist*, 1910, N.S., p. 24). Though there are few records of the Saint German family, those which do exist agree that Henry Saint German, or Jermyn, lived at Shilton beside Coventry; and there seems to be no reason for doubting that he was the father of Christopher Saint German.

Sir Henry Grey belonged to a family which had held high position. His ancestor, Edmund, Lord Treasurer of England, Baron Grey of Ruthyn, and Earl of Kent after 1465, attended the feast of serjeants-at-law at Ely Place in 1465 and "was first placed," to the dismay of the Lord Mayor and his adherents (Kingsford's *Stow, A Survey of London*, II. 36). George, son and heir of Edmund, had two sons who inherited the title: Richard, called a "waster" and a gambler, who died in 1523 without issue, and Henry, who

succeeded him with right to all the ancestral titles, but "not thinking his estate sufficient to support these dignities (for the last earl had wasted the greatest part of his estate)," he "declined taking on him those titles." He married Anne, daughter of "John Blennerhasset, of Frense, Norfolk, esquire, and co-heir to her brother John, of Southill, in the county of Bedford" (Hasted, *Hist. of Kent*, i. lxxiii-iv, cf. Edmund Lodge, *Gen. of the . . . Brit. Peerage*; *Cal. of Patent Rolls*; *Cal. of Anc. Deeds*, v. A11271, 13485; *Letters and Papers* . . . 1509-32, etc.).

From these details it seems that both Sir Henry Grey's wife and John Blennerhasset were cousins, in the modern sense, of Christopher Saint German. And as "Marybone" and "Maryborne" refer to the same church and as John Blennerhasset owned a dwelling in "Hamstede," this dwelling was perhaps the cause of their common interest in "Marybone."

In his letter of July 1539 to Thomas Cromwell (P.R.O., State Papers of Hen. VIII, 152/249, not the rather obscure summary in *Letters and Papers*, xiv, Pt. I, 1349) Saint German described William Boughton as his cousin; but as family records do not yet explain the relationship, the term may be used with a sixteenth-century meaning. Boughton's family was of "good antiquity" in Warwickshire. William himself was a squire of the body to Henry VIII, and at different times a sheriff of Warwickshire and Leicestershire. In 1516 he was granted a new patent of arms and a crest which, it is said, disregarded the more simple coat belonging to his grandfather, Thomas. By his wife, Anne (?) Danvers, William had a son and heir, Edward. By his next wife, Lady Elizabeth Barrington (daughter of John Brockett, and widow of Sir Nicholas Barrington), he had a son, Thomas (Dugdale, *Antiq. of Warw.*, i. 100, 288, and *passim*; *The Visitation of the Co. of Warwick* . . . Harl. Soc., v. 62; Wotton, *The Baronetage of England*, i. 393-4; *Cal. of Pat. Rolls*; Betham, *The Baronetage of England*, 415-424, etc.).

In the letter to Thomas Cromwell (reference above) Saint German stated that he had been named for years as Boughton's executor and that he desired a property settlement that would be fair to all the children of William Boughton. In one will, which Saint German had sent to Cromwell, Boughton had left him property, though he wished to use this interest for Boughton's children rather than for himself; but in another will, perhaps a later one, Lady

Barrington was named executor. An earlier letter from Roger Wigston to Cromwell (P.R.O., State Papers of Hen. VIII, 156/146) indicates that Boughton's step-children might have needed help against the intrepid Lady Barrington. Though the will of Boughton is not available, Saint German's appeal to Cromwell apparently brought results; for later documents indicate that Cromwell called Lady Barrington before him many times and that Edward, the son and heir, secured a large amount of property (see Lady Barrington's suit, Early Chan. Proc. 953/43; also Chan. Inq. P. M., Series II, v. 85, no. 85, Edward Boughton; and v. 115, no. 75, Thomas Boughton). Besides his aid in the settlement of property, Saint German probably sponsored Boughton at the Middle Temple; but the evidence will be presented later in this article.

As the Boughtons owned property in Bilton and in Long, Little, and Church Lawford (all in Knightlow Hundred), and as Catthorpe, Leicester, was only a few miles away, we have in the Boughton relationship one explanation for the places Saint German named in his will. And since Edward Boughton, son and heir of William, married Elizabeth, the daughter of William Willington, or Wollington, we have possibly a personal connection for the demise to William Wollington in 1527 (Harley MS. 1196, 24^b; *Cal. of Anc. Deeds*, v. 12390).

A property transaction of 1508 in which four Throkmortons were concerned has already been mentioned. The Throkmortons, a prominent Warwickshire family, included varied personalities: Sir Robert, who died abroad on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land shortly before 1520, and who left money for pious, architectural, and educational purposes, such as the management of a "Grammar School, freely for all his Tenants children"; his sister Elizabeth, "the last Abbas of Denye"; his son, Antony, killed at the battle of Pavia, 1525; his son, Michael, who lived abroad in the retinue of Cardinal Pole and died in Mantua; his daughter Catherine, who married a Boughton of Lawford, Warwickshire; his son and heir George, who was made a knight in 1525 or 1526, who attended the coronation of Anne Boleyn, and who was at times sheriff of Warwickshire and Leicestershire. The wife of George was Katherine, daughter of Nicholas, Lord Vaux, of Harrowden. When George started building a mansion at Coughton Court, Thomas Cromwell beheld his estate "with a rapacious eye" and had him imprisoned for refusing the oath of supremacy. He meant to die

for the "same principles as Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More professed. But Queen Catherine Parr, niece to Sir George's lady, begged the life of her uncle" and secured preferment at court for three of his sons (see Wills, P.C.C. 2 Maynwaryng and F. 22 Tashe; Wotton, *op. cit.*, 478-86; Dugdale, *Antiq. of Warw.*, II. 749-751 and *passim*; Burke, *A Gen. and Her. Hist. of the Peerage*, 1935; Betham, *op. cit.*). Perhaps this account, by Wotton, of Sir George's being freed through Queen Catherine Parr contains some fancy, as Henry VIII was not married to her until 1543. But in 1536 Sir George was denying complicity with the followers of Robert Aske; in 1537 he was committed to the Tower; on October 20, 1537, Lady Throckmorton was writing her brother, "Mr. Parre," about the situation; in April 1538 Cromwell's *Remembrances* included the item "To remember Sir George Throgmerton for his liberty." Probably he was freed before 1538 was over; and in November 1539 he was one of the knights to receive Anne of Cleves. In June 1540 Cromwell was denying certain testimony of Throckmorton; and in May 1541 Throckmorton received a grant in fee of the manor of Oversley and "other lands, once part of the possessions of Thomas Cromwell" (*Letters and Papers*, XI. 1405-1406; XII, Pt. II, 921, 951, 952, 953, 1023; XIII, Pt. I, 878; XIV, Pt. II, 572, 619; XVI. 878, No. 80).

Probably this George Throckmorton was the one connected with Christopher Saint German in the transfer of Warwickshire property, 1508; Antony and Michael, named in the same transaction, were perhaps the brothers whose lives ended in Italy; he had an uncle, Richard, who may have been the fourth Throckmorton concerned with the property. Other possible connections with George Throckmorton will be mentioned later in the discussion of the Middle Temple.

In spite of the tradition about the Inner Temple, separate pieces of evidence show that Christopher Saint German belonged to the Middle Temple. About 1506, "Richard Pynson, of London, printer of bokes," brought suit in chancery concerning the printing of 409 copies of the "Abridgement of Statutes." The suit was directed against Robert Bowryng, Robert Fermour, and "Cristofer Seynt Jermyn, gentylmen of ye mydell tempull of London" (Early Chan. Proc. 345/4). Records of the Middle Temple, though they are incomplete, support this evidence (see *Minutes of the Parl. of the Middle Temple*, ed. by Chas. T. Martin, I. and index in IV.). In

1502, Seynt German, Bowryng, Rastell, and several others were fined "because they were Utter Barristers and did not attend Parliament." Records of a Seynt German, with no first name given, continue to 1511. From 1505-1513 there are records also of a "Boughton, junior" who is once called William Boughton. In 1510 he was admitted to clerk's commons and pardoned a vacation "at the instance of Seynt Germain"; in 1511 he was pardoned other vacations and offices because "he alleged on the testimony of Seynt Germain that it was promised him at his first admission."

The "Master Bowryng" of Middle Temple Records, 1502-1512, is probably the Robert Bowryng named in Pynson's suit. Edward Warner, 1509-1525, and John Spenser, 1509-1513, may be the men named in property transactions of 1508 and 1510. A Christopher Bretyn, admitted as clerk in 1522, is perhaps the person who was named executor of Saint German's will. A certain "Hord, junior," admitted to clerk's commons in 1511 "at the instance of Master Seynt Germain," does not yet appear in other connections. No Henry Grey is named, though Saint German's will mentioned a sum which had been spent for his "speciall aduantage in the temple"; but a Richard Grey, given liberty in 1508-09 to be "in commons and out of commons at his liking," may possibly be Henry's older brother. In 1505 a "Master Throgmerton, junior, son of Robt. Throgmerton, knight," was admitted; in 1512 a Throgmerton, junior, was admitted to clerks' commons, and in 1521, "Master George Throckmerton" was assigned to a room recently vacated. Perhaps these items refer to Sir George Throckmorton of Warwickshire.

The Rastell who was fined with Seynt German and others in 1502 was very probably John Rastell, brother-in-law of Sir Thomas More. He was so identified by A. W. Reed (*Trans. of the Bibl. Soc.*, xv. 59-82); but in the same article, where the property transaction including Saint German and Rastell was named, Saint German was mentioned by error as Charles. As Rastell and Saint German were both utter barristers in 1502, they had probably been associated for several years before at the Middle Temple; in 1508 they were concerned, with others, in Warwickshire property; in 1523, perhaps, and certainly in 1528 Rastell printed the Latin edition of Saint German's *Dialogus*. Perhaps the facts are by no means exhausted, for the connection of Thomas Cromwell with Rastell and Saint German has resemblances as well as differences.

There is no evidence, so far, of direct association between Saint German and Sir Thomas More. But another indirect connection appears in activities of Sir Henry Grey. Frequently a member of Bedfordshire commissions, he served on such commissions in 1529, 1530, and 1532, with Sir Thomas More, Lord Chancellor.

A Mr. Saint German had definite connections with Thomas Cromwell from 1533 to 1539. The appeal to Cromwell about Boughton's property in 1539 was signed "Crystofer Seynt Germayne." If Christopher Saint German wrote all the works which are usually attributed to him, there is reason for believing that he was the man mentioned by Thomas Cromwell in several items. In Cromwell's accounts for 1533 this item appeared: "Mr. Saynte Germyn, for parsonage at Blakemore, 13s. 4d." (*Letters and Papers* . . . vi. 228, i). In 1534, Cromwell's agents, needing a learned lawyer to help in debates at Blackfriars, had hoped to have "Master Seyntgerman," but he, "diuers tymes spoken unto . . . trustyth to be excusyd . . . for suche consyderacons as he hathe signyfyed unto you" (*Letters and Papers*, vii. 1008, and also the fuller account, P.R.O.). In 1536 the "northern rebels" mentioned "Seynt Germayne" as one whose heresies should be destroyed (*Letters and Papers*, xi. 1246. Cited in *D.N.B.*). In 1537 Cromwell noted among his *Remembrances*: "To show St. Germyn's opinion upon the Bishop's book" (*ibid.*, xii. 1151, 2).

To Professor John P. Dawson, University of Michigan Law School, I am indebted for two other items about Saint German. On November 29, 1506, he was an arbiter for Thomas Swynerton in the case of Johane Swynerton v. Thomas Swynerton (Reg. of Court of Requests, III, 212b). On January 28, 1529, a Saint Germyn was named among the counselors who "did sytt in the Courte of Requestes in the tyme of Kinge Henrye the viijth" (Leadam, *Select Cases in the Court of Requests*, p. cii).

From the present evidence Saint German's mature life has three periods: activity at the Middle Temple and in law practice, before 1511; inactivity, perhaps, or study, 1511-1523 or 1528; publication and a certain usefulness to the State, 1523 or 1528-1535. Other records may come to light, especially for the second of these periods. In 1539 he wrote Cromwell, he said, because he was not able to come to him; and the letter, which may be in his own handwriting, seems to have been written by a man who was ill or old, or both. His will was proved May 30, 1541.

ROBERT TOFTE

(concluded)

BY FRANKLIN B. WILLIAMS, JR.

II

The canon of Robert Tofte's published works is roughly determined by the titlepage ascription "By R.T.Gentleman." The initials appear on the titles of all his books except *Ariosto's Saytres*, which was erroneously published as by Gervase Markham.¹ The initials also appear on the second title of one of his manuscripts. Tofte's name appears only once in his published books, and only once in the Stationers' Register; but with a single exception there is specific evidence associating him with each volume. The canon accepted in this survey embraces two manuscripts and the following printed works: *Laura*, 1597; *Two Tales Translated out of Ariosto*, 1597; *Orlando Inamorato*, 1598; *Alba*, 1598; *Of Mariage and Wiuing*, 1599; *Ariosto's Satyres*, 1608; *Three Elegies* appended to the second edition of the *Satyres*, 1611; *Honours Academie*, 1610; and *The Blazon of Iealousie*, 1615.

To corroborate the canon there is a rime peculiarity characteristic of Tofte's known verse and applicable to any further verse attributed to him. The test is Tofte's excessive tolerance of false rimes of a type illustrated in the couplet from *Alba* (sig. B5) which Grosart declared "worthy of Robert Greene":

LOVES prisoner then, begging at Beauties gate,
Some Almcs bestow sweet Ladie for Gods sake

Scattered through Tofte's verse are numerous such false rimes or assonances; the rime-consonants are normally *t:k*, *t:p*, *k:p*,

¹ The simple initials *R.T.* appear in the following: *Discourse . . . that Peter was neuer at Rome*, 1572; the broadside ballad of *The Crowe sits vpon the wall*, 1592; and *A Brief Treatise on the Vse of the Globe Celestiall*, 1616. These are attributed respectively to Christopher Carlile, Richard Tarlton, and Robert Tanner. The first edition of the *Discourse* is dedicated by R.T., but Carlile's name is substituted in the second edition [? 1580].

m : n, and *f : th*. To illustrate the peculiarity I have selected a few examples¹:

Laura : sig. D7 disdain : same, D7^v HART : Parke, hope : broke, D8^v spite : like, E1 concaite : breake, E3^v same : faine, E4^v leaue : Wreathe.

Orlando Inamorato : B2^v mine : time, B3^v like : fight, B4 name : faine, B4^v sleepe : leeke [like], C3^v salute : looke, C4^v can : stan[d], D4^v strike : quite.

Alba : B1 sweete : seeke, B5 same : paine, B5^v himselfe : wealth, B7 seeme : greene, B8 hate : make, C1 art : darke, C2^v dislike : quite, C4^v sweete : weepe, C5^v late : take.

Ariosto's Satyres : p. 2 make : predestinate, 4 wealth : selfe, 6 therein : bring, 19 seeke : keep, 20 accept : neglect, 29 remember : render, 31 write : like.

Three Elegies : p. 3 cheeke : meete, 7 sake : gate, gon : belong, 13 broke : hope, 20 sustaines : beames, 21 throate : smoake, 22 Fane : name.

Honours Academie : Part I, p. 8 thicke : it, 9 fame : slaine, 12 sweete : deepe, 17 death : leafe, 18 keepe : sweete, 19 reprieft : teeth, 21 thinke : stint.

The Fruits of Iealousie : p. 67 againe : shame, 68 wight : like, 72 keepe : meet, 76 faine : fame, 78 smooth : Loue, 81 wreath : leaue, 84 sweet : meeke.

In his delightful edition of *The Batchelars Banquet*² Professor F. P. Wilson suggests that this anonymous translation of *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage* be considered for Tofte's canon. The earliest surviving edition of the justly popular *Banquet* is dated 1603, but a translation, either this one or another, is known to have been published in 1599. It was among the books burned in that year with Tofte's *Of Mariage and Wiuing*. Professor Wilson's tentative attribution rests on the nature of the subject matter and the style. As he points out, *Les Quinze Joyes* is exactly the sort of book that appealed to Tofte. He shows similarities of style and parallels of phrase between *The Batchelars Banquet* and *Of Mariage and Wiuing*. Professor Wilson's advocacy is skilful, but he judiciously concludes that "the evidence is too slight to assign the work to his pen." One agrees regretfully, for the book would greatly advance Tofte's position as a writer. The *Banquet* is written in rich, idiomatic prose, and its intrinsic merit is superior to any of Tofte's translations.

¹ I have not had an opportunity to work with the *Two Tales*. Apropos of rime, it may be mentioned that Tofte, like Sir John Harrington, uses dialect rimes like Shakespeare's *daughter* : *after* (Chorus before Act IV of *The Winter's Tale*). Tofte's examples include : soft : wrought, oft : sought : aloft, oft : brought, oft : naught.

² (Oxford, 1929.) Professor Wilson has compressed much useful information about Tofte into two pages of his scholarly and interesting introduction, pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

In place of a strictly chronological order, I shall consider Tofte's books in three groups, his original works, his translations from Italian, and his translations from French. Before proceeding one may notice a puzzling association of Tofte with Gervase Markham. Tofte's translation of *Ariosto's Satyres* was published in 1608 as "In English, by Geruis Markham," an error corrected by the publication of the second edition anonymously. The transfer of the copy of *Honours Academie* in the Stationers' Register in 1609 mentions "Jarvis Markam" as the translator, although the work was properly attributed when published in 1610. Both books were more or less pirated, and perhaps Markham was concerned in supplying the manuscripts to the publishers. On the other hand, he may have been a friend of Tofte's, the *I.M.Gent.* who wrote verses before *Alba*. This possibility might inspire confidence if the *Anth.Mar.* who wrote verses for *The Blazon of Iealousie* could be shown to be a Markham.

Unmentioned in the Stationers' Register, Tofte's first book was published in 1597 with the following title: *Laura. The Toyes of a Traveller. Or The Feast of Fancie. Divided into three Parts. By R.T.Gentleman. Poca fauilla gran fiamma seconda.* [Ornament.] London, Printed by Valentine Sims. 1597.¹ Only two copies are recorded in the *Short-Title Catalogue*; if Grosart may be credited, that in the Huntington Library lacks the brief "Errata" found in the British Museum copy.² The little octavo was published with an elaborate pretence of piracy which will not endure examination. In the dedication Tofte hopes that "your Ladiship wil keep them as priuately, as I send them vnto you willingly." The printer feigns that the verses came into his hands "by mere fortune," and that "What the Gentleman was that wrote these Verses, I know not." "A Friends iust excuse" at the end of the volume declares that "this Poeme is made thus publicly knowen" without the author's knowledge and despite efforts to suppress the edition "at the last sheetes printing." This excuse, signed by the probably fictitious initials *R.B.*, deepens the mystification by protesting that "more than thirtie Sonnets not his" are intermixt. Every feature of the book contradicts the pretence of piracy. The work was published with care, in all completeness. It is equipped with a dedication

¹ *Laura* was edited by E. Arber in *An English Garner*, viii. (1896), 267-340, and reprinted in Sidney Lee's *Elizabethan Sonnets* (1904), ii. 351-424.

² See Grosart's introduction to *Alba*, p. xliii. The Huntington copy was then at Lampport Hall.

and verses to a second lady. The "Errata" is not of a printer's devising. The exact symmetry of the text makes the presence of thirty spurious sonnets incredible; *R.B.*'s remark that the reader "will with lesse paine distinguish betweene them, than I on this sodaine possibly can" is ironically true, for as Sir Sidney Lee observed, they cannot be distinguished.

Laura is dedicated to "the no lesse vertuous, than faire" Lady Lucy Percy, sister to Henry, third (or ninth) Earl of Northumberland. Another brother, William Percy, is known as a sonneteer. Nothing is known of Tofte's acquaintance with Lady Lucy, and he increases the obscurity by referring to "the intricate Laborinth of so manie and infinite troubles allotted (most vnworthely) vnto you, by the irreuocable doome of your too partiall and flintie Destinie." Preliminary verses to Lady *E.C.* make the first use of Tofte's literary nickname, emphasizing his initials:

And though the note (thy praises onely fit)
Of sweetest Bird, the dulcet Nightingale:
Disdaine not little Roben Red-bres^T yet,
What he doth want in learning or in skill,
He doth supply with zeale of his good will.

The book is divided into three parts, each containing forty numbered poems and a conclusion signed *R.T.* The "sonnets" are alternately of twelve and ten lines. The dedication describes them as "a few Toyes of mine owne trauell, most parte conceiued in Italie, and some of them brought forth in England." In keeping, many of the poems are endorsed with the names of Italian cities. The second poem purports to have been written in London just before his departure, and the final poem looks forward to his home-coming. In describing "the follies of my rechlesse youth," Tofte borrowed from Petrarch both the name of his mistress and some of his themes, such as the laurel's protection against lightning (sig. E2).

There is no pretence of piracy about Tofte's second octavo of original verse. *Alba, The Months Minde of a Melancholy Louer, diuided into three parts: By R.T.Gentleman* was printed in 1598 by Felix Kingston for Matthew Lownes, without entry of the copy.¹ The unique exemplar, formerly in the library of Alfred H. Huth, is now in the Huntington Library. I have relied on the text in Grosart's reprint. *Alba* lacks an avowed dedication; instead there

¹ Edited by A. B. Grosart (Manchester, 1880).

are three poems addressed by *R.T.* to Lady Anne Herne, to Sir Calisthenes Brooke, one of the Queen's "chiefe Commanders" in Ireland, and to Sir John Brooke, a captain in the Low Countries. All three were children of Sir Henry Brooke *alias* Cobham of Sutton, Kent.¹ Little can be learned of Sir Calisthenes, who was knighted in Ireland in 1597 and died before 1612. Sir John was created Baron Cobham in 1645. Lady Anne was the wife of Sir Edward Herne or Heron, K.B., of Cressey Hall, Lincolnshire. To her Tofte also dedicated *Honours Academie*, in which he apparently alludes to her daughter Elizabeth as

The *Phoenix* faire, sprung from your Ashes sweete.

Prefixed to *Alba* are commendatory verses by Richard Day, Gent., by *Ignoto*, by *I.M.Gent.*, and by Master *R.A.*, each with answering verses by Tofte. None of the writers can be identified beyond cavil. Day was clearly a relative of the poet's aunt, Mrs. Elizabeth Day. From William Berry's statement that her husband was a nephew of Bishop Day,² Grosart concluded that the writer was Richard, son of William Day, Bishop of Winchester. The probability that Tofte spent some time in Winchester supports this identification. Richard Day might also be sought among the kinsmen of Bishop Day's elder brother, George, Bishop of Chichester.³ The name of *Ignoto*, "A friend, though a stranger to the Author," suggests *Il Incognito*, who has verses before *The Blazon of Jealousie*. Tofte refers to *I.M.* as singing along the Mersey. Robert Allott has been suggested as *R.A.*, but although Tofte was later well acquainted with his miscellany, *England's Parnassus*, there is no evidence that he knew Allott. *R.A.* was younger than Tofte, and he was also a lover. The line,

Thus chirpe one ROBIN REDBREST to another,

suggests that his name was also Robert. Tofte's nickname of *Robin Redbreast* is used in all the commendatory verses. This

¹ Calisthenes is not mentioned in genealogical works, but he is named in the will of his mother, Lady Anne Cobham, in 1612 (P.C.C., 1 *Fenner*).

² *County Genealogies. Pedigrees of the Families in the County of Hants* (London, 1833), p. 357.

³ Bishop George Day names several Sussex relatives in his will (P.C.C., 22 *Keichyn*, 1556), but in the absence of other evidence that he was married, his "mother-in-law" Joan Day is probably to be understood as "step-mother," a common meaning. The Declared Accounts show that in 1586 one Richard Daye, servant to Sir Thomas Browne, was paid for carrying letters to Court from Sussex (P.R.O., E 351/542, membrane 82).

coincidence, together with the fact that the verses are all conveniently supplied in the measure in which the whole book is written, might suggest that Tofte wrote his own commendatory verses. A heretic might suspect that he invented some of the initials.

The subtitle to *Alba* rests on an ill-advised figurative application of a Catholic memorial service for the dead to a living mistress :

Once I each Month to CRVEL ALBA make,
A MONTHS MIND, yet no pitie she doth take.

Prefixed by a fanciful verse dedication to Alba's portrait, the text is in three sections. Throughout the volume, despite the absence of typographical indication, each page of text constitutes a separate poem. Thus *Alba* is a sequence of "sonnets," each composed of four six-line stanzas of the pattern used in *Venus and Adonis*. A few of the poems are products of Tofte's Italian journey; they are dated from Rome, Mantua, and Fano. Two are dated from London and Burnham (Bucks). Some of the pieces show considerable merit, but the only well known one contains the earliest allusion to Shakespeare's comedy, beginning (sig. G5) :

LOVES LABOR LOST, I once did see a Play,
Cyleped so, so called to my paine,
Which I to heare to my small Ioy did stay,
Giuing attendance on my froward Dame.

Alba is clearly Laura under a new name. In his two volumes of verse Tofte indulges an Elizabethan delight in mystification, sprinkling the text with obscure allusions and typographical tricks like the capitalization of his initials in "HaRT." Since I can offer no solution, I will not repeat the evidence bearing on the identity of the mistress whom he addresses in turn as Laura and Alba. She was not one of the women to whom he dedicated his books.¹ The text of both books, as J. P. Collier pointed out,² indicates that Alba's name, maiden or married, was Caryl :

Then constant CARE, not Comfort I do craue,
And (might I chuse) I CARE with L. would haue.

She may reasonably be identified with the "bellissima sua Signora. E.C." to whom Tofte addressed verses before *Laura*. From sources unknown to others, W. C. Hazlitt supplied the Christian name

¹ Erroneously suggested by J. O. Halliwell in *Some Account of Tofte's Alba* (London, 1865).

² *A Bibliographical . . . Account of the Rarest Books* (London, 1865), ii. 437-438, citing *Alba*, sig. E3^r, and *Laura*, D1. A more complete treatment of the problem is given by Grosart in his *Alba*, pp. x-xi.

Euphemia.¹ Since Tofte was associated with Chilworth, I hoped to find a clue among the Carylls of nearby Tangley, but pedigrees, wills, and parish registers have proved fruitless. In particular I found no Euphemia Caryll. Alba was a married woman, and her husband was living, although moral Dr. Grosart felt obliged to make her "that most dangerous of animals, a young widow."² In conclusion, the incessant references to pearls or margarites suggest that Alba's name was Margaret.

In the concluding poems of *Alba* Tofte, *Il Disgratiato*, introduces a note of resignation to the failure of his suit, a pretence of converting his passion to a Platonic affection. The change prepares for the first appendix to the volume, "Certaine Diuine Poems written by the foresaid Author R.T.Gentleman." In accordance with the fashion set in his friend Thomas Watson's *Hekatompathia*, Tofte seeks to convince the reader that now in his maturity, "A Conuertite from *Vaine Loue*," he has directed his mind to heaven. One may not assume that the poems postdate *Alba*. Some must be quite early, particularly, unless the expression of age is merely a conventional measure of maturity,³ the one beginning (I2) :

Full 7. times foure of yeeres my life hath runne,
Whil'st to my selfe a *heauy Burthen* sore,
To others I a gainlesse charge become.

The second appendix is more difficult to account for, a prose translation of "A most excellent patheticall, and passionate Letter of Duke D'Epernoun, Minion, vnto Henry the third, King of France and Polonia, when through the Duke of Guizes deuise and meanes he was forbidden the presence of the King." Perhaps Tofte implied a parallel between d'Epernoun's banishment from court and his own banishment from the presence of Alba. I have not found the source of Tofte's text.

Tofte's third original book, his unpublished *Discourse of the fūe laste Popes*, survives in the autograph presentation copy at Lambeth Palace, Lambeth MS. 1112.⁴ The dedication is dated

¹ *Hand-Book*, p. 609.

² *Alba* (1880), p. 149. His conscience also blinded Dr. Grosart to the transparent anagram *Dnabsuh*, which Tofte uses twice in *The Fruits of Iealousie*, p. 79. Grosart naively found it an "odd word . . . apparently = servant."—*Alba*, p. xxiv.

³ Compare Iago's remark, "I haue look'd vpon the world for foure times seuen yeares"—*Othello*, I. iii. In 1598 Tofte's age was five times seven.

⁴ Briefly described by H. J. Todd in *A Catalogue of the Archiepiscopal Manuscripts in the Library at Lambeth Palace* (London, 1812).

"ffrom my Lodginge in Holbourne this first of Januarie 1598," and internal evidence indicates that it was 1597/8.¹ Although Tofte may have prepared the first draft in Italy internal evidence shows that the final form was written in England late in 1597. The manuscript is a bound quarto volume of about one hundred unnumbered leaves, written carefully and illustrated with engravings and woodcuts. The neat titlepage describes the book as *A Discourse of the fiue laste Popes of Rome and of the firste Originall and begininge of that famous Pilgrimage of our Ladie of Loreto. Whereunto is added a Draughte of the Lienes of all such Romane Cardinalls, as are Liuinge. . . . Gathered and Collected throughe the Trauell and Industrie of Robert Tofte Gentleman.*

There is a signed dedication to Richard Bancroft, Bishop of London and later Archbishop of Canterbury, whose acquaintance Tofte doubtless made when he was rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn. Tofte explains that in Rome he was eager to gather what he could about the popes and cardinals, as well as about the city. He dedicates the book to Bancroft for his merits and

By Promise, as hauinge geuen my worde vnto your Lordshipp longe agonne. By Dewtie, because I am bounde vnto yow; not onelie for my self, but for myne especiall good ffreind M^r Peter Lewes whome yow haue not a litle graced with your kinde fauours.

I have not identified Peter Lewes. Tofte makes a graceful apology for his book.

I presume to bringe this my Booke vnto yow this Christmas resemblinge herein some cunyinge Drapers of Wattlingstreet who when they would vtter a bad peece of clothe vnto their best customer, they carrye it vnto the falsest windowe they haue—thinckinge by reason of the litle Light, the Culler and Dye thereof will shewe the better in the darke.² So I present this peece of Woorke these short Holydayes vnto your Lordshipp, that readinge the same by Candle Light, and viewinge the Pictures therein inserted with liuelie Cullers, yow maye thincke it sheweth farre better, and seemeth to be of more value then it is anie waye by desert.

¹ The life of Gregory XIV remarks that Alfonso Duke of Ferrara (d. October 27, 1597), "is . . . late reported to be dead." The life of Clement VIII (elected January 30, 1592) says that "he hathe bene nowe some sixe yeares Pope."

² A device noted by the satirists, as I. H[earth?] in *The House of Correction*, 1619, sig. A6:

*Lincus the Draper, for his more auayle,
Dams vp his lights to set his Ware to sayle;*

• • •
Deeme you his conscience darker then his shoppe.

The workmanlike compilation is remarkably free from theological animus, and, for the most part, disappointingly impersonal. The titlepage sufficiently indicates the contents except for the final item, a three-page Latin "Pasquinata or Libell made in Rome" on the death of the Duke of Guise. The brief sketches of sixty-one cardinals have a separate titlepage, *A Drawghte of the Liues of all suche Romane Cardinalls as are att this Daye Liuinge, euerie one sett in his righte Cullers, by R.T. Gentlemā The number . . . are 60.*¹ Tofte refers to the merchant Sir Horatio Palavicino, "free Denizen here in Englande," and to Benedict Spinola, who "some Twentie yeares since liued and dyed here in the Cittie of London beinge one of the greatest Marchantes of Strangers that liued in his tyme."² There is only one hint of Tofte the misogynist: "So as it was thought (had she not had her desier in secreet) she had died for him, yf it be a thinge possible that women may dye for loue."³

Tofte probably drew on Italian books for material as well as for his inserted illustrations, but I have not identified the sources. The inserted pictures were crudely coloured under Tofte's direction. The first is a large portrait of Sixtus V, with a pictorial frame of the monuments of his reign (1585-1590). The engraving is dated 1589, and bears the abbreviated signature of Battista Pensieri Parmensis. The unsigned, folio-size engravings of Urban VII, Gregory XIV, and Innocent IX seem to have been taken from a single book, but I have been unable to identify it. Crudely executed in the same style, they are half-length portraits on a ground of horizontal lines. The subjects are seated, dressed in fur-lined caps and capes. A folio portrait of Clement VIII shows head and shoulders, in tiara and vestments. In the cardinals' lives are pasted small woodcuts, taken collectively from a book or from a broadside of portraits. Tofte mentions a picture of Loreto, but it is missing.

Tofte's first translation from Italian was *Two Tales, Translated out of Ariosto*, 1597, which I shall presently claim to be in reality a second part to *Orlando Inamorato*. The apparently unique copy of *Two Tales*, formerly in the libraries of Britwell Court and of W. A. White, is now in the Folger Library in Washington. The title of the *Two Tales* continues: *The one in dispraise of Men, the other in disgrace of Women. With certaine other Italian Stanzes and Prouerbs.*

¹ Tofte apparently did not count the sketch of Cardinal William Allen, who had died in 1595.

² Cardinal's life 22.

³ Cardinal's life 52.

By R.T. Gentleman. [motto and ornament] Printed at London by Valentine Sims. . . . 1597. The printer exculpates the translator from having done the pamphlet "to compare (as it were) with master Harringtons verses," and explains that the work was done "in the yeere 1592. he being then in Italie."

The *Two Tales*, as one might suspect, are indecorous episodes from *Orlando Furioso*, translated in *ottava rima*. Both are from Canto 43, and Tofte quotes the first line of each in the original, with stanza references. The first is the tale of Melissa, which is dated "Siena 28. Lulio 1592." The second is the episode of Anselm, Argia, and Adonio, to which is added a brief, suggestive envoy to a "faire Ladie," signed "Dixi R.T. In Napoli agli 27. di Marzo. 1593." Aside from this envoy and a concluding stanza, there is no trace of the "other Italian Stanzas and Prouerbs" mentioned in the title. It is conceivable that these followed on sheets now lost.

Orlando Inamorato is almost as rare as the *Two Tales*, the *Short-Title Catalogue* reporting copies only at the British Museum and the Bodleian. Printed by Valentine Sims, the titlepage is dated 1598. The preliminaries and text occupy signatures A1 to I3, the blank I4 being present in the Oxford, but not in the London copy. Now the *Two Tales*, issued in the same quarto format and style by the same printer, occupy signatures K1 to N4. It is obvious that the *Two Tales* were printed as an appendix to *Orlando*, although it is uncertain whether they were intended for sale together or separately. The discrepancy in titlepage dates, 1597 for the *Tales* and 1598 for *Orlando*, is easily explained. The first sheet of *Orlando* was printed last, as was the usual practice; this can be proved by the awkward way in which, after the preliminaries, the opening stanzas of the text have been stretched out on signatures A3^v-A4^v to fill the pages. The dedication describes the book as "a New-yeers gift these Hollidayes," sent "these short dayes in Christmas." It is clear that the book was printed at the end of 1597, as the second titlepage is dated, but that the printer postdated the main titlepage, printed last, to promote sales. Tofte's gift was for New Year's 1597/8, not 1598/9.

The popularity of Sir John Harington's *Orlando Furioso*, 1591, suggested that there might be profit in an English version of Boiardo's *Orlando Inamorato*. On June 26, 1592, John Charlewood entered the "*Histoire de Roland L'amoureux Comprenant les Chevaleureux faictes d'armes et d'amours Devisée en trios liures* to be translated

into English." From the entry it is clear that Charlewood planned a hack translation from the French version of Jacques Vincent. Charlewood died in the following year, and his successor, James Roberts, let the project die. When Tofte began his independent translation, he went directly to the Italian text in the revision of Lodovico Domenichi, using, if not the handsome Venice quarto of 1588, one very close to it.

Sims's titlepage of 1598 runs: *Orlando Inamorato The three first Bookes of that famous Noble Gentleman and learned Poet, Mathew Maria Boiardo Earle of Scandiano in Lombardie. Done into English Heroicall Verse, By R.T.Gentleman.* To Tofte, as to Harington, "English Heroicall Verse" was *ottava rima*. The pamphlet contains not the "three first Bookes" of Boiardo's huge poem, but merely the first three cantos of Book I; the whole has never been translated into English.¹ Aside from verses of his own at the beginning of each canto and at the end of the pamphlet, Tofte translates stanza for stanza. In the course of the three cantos he introduces five explanatory stanzas not in the Italian. The book is dedicated by R.T. to Lady Margarite Morgan, wife of Sir John Morgan of Chilworth, as a New Year's gift in return for favours which he and his elder brother had enjoyed at Chilworth. Since the book was being presented at the same New Year as the manuscript *Discourse of the five laste Popes*, it is not surprising that the dedication repeats the story of the draper's shop. In the text Tofte makes three allusions to Lady Anne Herne by punning on her maiden name of Brooke. He concludes that if Alba will only be kind,

My Muse now dead, againe to life shall rise,
Singing anew, ORLA[N]DOS louely song.

Although the titlepage initials are the only positive evidence Tofte doubtless translated *Of Mariage and Wiuing*, which was entered by Thomas Creede on March 6, 1598/9, and was published immediately thereafter.² The subject was akin to his later translations, *Ariosto's Satyres* and *The Blazon of Iealousie*. Of all his works, this prose pamphlet attained the greatest notoriety. The unexampled outburst of satire and epigram then approaching its peak alarmed the censoring authorities. On June 1, 1599, Arch-

¹ The prose version of William S. Rose, 1823, is an abridgment, in Rose's words, "a mere ground-plan of the Gothic edifice of Boiardo."

² The entry was probably copied from the printed titlepage. It also names the translator as "R.T. gent."

bishop Whitgift and Bishop Bancroft issued an order condemning nine books, ranging from Joseph Hall's famous *Virgidentia* to "The booke againste woemen viz, of marriage and wyvinge." Tofte's book was burned at Stationers' Hall on June 4 with six other books, including John Marston's *The Scourge of Villanie*, Edward Guilpin's *Skialetheia*, and the lost translation of *Les Quinze Joyes de Mariage*.¹ Despite the burning, *Of Mariage and Wiuing* has survived in four recorded copies. It would be interesting to know what effect his action as a censor had on Tofte's friendship with Bishop Bancroft.

Of Mariage and Wiuing is a blackletter quarto, printed by Thomas Creede, to be sold by John Smethwick. The titlepage continues: *An Excellent, pleasant, and Philosophicall Controversie, betweene the two famous Tassi now liuing, the one Hercules the Philosopher, the other Torquato the Poet. Done into English, by R.T.Gentleman.* The title of the original is *Dello Ammogliersi Piaceuole Contesa Fra i due Moderni Tassi, Hercole, cioè, & Torquato*.² I have found no edition containing the 1598 dedication translated by Tofte. Ercole's oration contains a long passage of lively colloquial speech, which Professor Wilson compares with *The Batchelars Banquet*. Tofte found it necessary to tamper with the text for English consumption:

Et hora chi mantiene la setta di
Vgone et di Caluino ne[ll]a Flandra;
nella Francia, et nella Inghilterra, se
non la propria Reina d'Inghilterra?
(fol. 30^v)

And at this day I pray you who
maintaineth and of late hath
maintained so many kind of reli-
gions as are in *Germanie*, and in
other places therabouts, but only
the busie headed women of the
said countries? (sig. G2^v)

Perhaps it was to remedy this omission of the Queen that Tofte tactfully substituted her name for one of the two Italian ladies whom the Tassi praise in such editions as I have seen. Tofte makes Torquato say of "the famous English Queen" that he is "far insufficient and vnable to praise her, by reason of her royall qualities, and matchlesse vertues."

The absence of preliminary matter by or respecting the translator

¹ E. Arber, *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers*, III, 677-678. Arber's *Transcript* is utilized elsewhere without reference.

² Using the Bergamo edition of 1595.

suggests that *Of Mariage and Wiuing* was pirated; evidence is lacking. Tofte's next book was certainly pirated. Roger Jackson entered the copy on September 21, 1608, as "*a President for Satoristes or the Seven famous Satyres or Planettes* written by Master Lodovico Ariosto." Nicholas Okes printed the book in quarto for Jackson, and it was published in 1608 as *Ariosto's Satyres, in Seuen Famous Discourses, shewing the State, 1 of the Court, and Courtiers. . . . In English, by Geruis Markham*. Tofte explicitly claims the book three times in *The Blazon of Iealousie*. He mentions Ariosto's satires, "which Satyres I translated into English Verse, with Notes vpon the same; although vnknowne to mee, they were set forth in another mans name" (p. 6). Again he writes (p. 28), "read my *Ariostoes* Satyres in English." Markham's name is crossed out in the British Museum copy, and in an early seventeenth century hand is inserted "Robert Toft Gentelman." If Jackson did not learn the identity of the author, he at least found that it was not Markham, for in 1611 the second edition was published anonymously. The new titlepage mentions Tofte's annotations: *Ariostos Seuen Planets Gouverning Italie. Or His Satyrs. . . . Newly Corrected and Augmented, with many excellent and note worthy Notes, together with a new Addition of three most excellent Elegies, written by the same Lodouico Ariosto*.

Both editions prefix an unsigned epistle praising Ariosto and asking thanks for "thy Country-man, who for thy sake, without any other recompence, hath taken the paines in most exquisite manner, to be thy interpreter." The prose "argument of the whole worke" is clearly by Tofte, who borrows from it in *The Blazon of Iealousie*. Tofte translates the satires in fluent couplets. In the line

La rondine in un dì vi muor di rabbia,

he introduces his own pet name (p. 33):

The Robin red-brest rob'd of libertie,
Growes sad and dies with inward melancholy.

Tofte's notes begin in the margin and spread across the bottom of many pages. His comment is factual, dealing with Italian geography, biography, literature, and customs. He translates the familiar epitaph of Aretino (p. 84), and quotes (p. 61) four lines from Haring-

ton's *Orlando Furioso* (VII. 63). He provides English versions of two Italian proverbs, as (p. 56) :

Whose horse is white, and wife is faire,
His head is neuer void of care.¹

The augmentation in the second edition comprises some two dozen additional notes, distinguished by the index. They are for the most part rather puerile, and perhaps not by Tofte. The 1611 edition of the *Satyres* probably gave Robert Anton the suggestion for *The Philosophers Satyrs*, 1616.

Appended to the 1611 edition, and separately paged, are

Three most excellent Elegies written by that famous Poet, Lodouico Ariosto : the first vttered by Il Disgratiato,² who through extreme rage pulled out his owne eyes : the second by Don Infelice, who with sorrow wept out his eyes : and the third by Disauenturato, who with a passion of madnesse, burnt out his eyes with the scorching heate of the Sunne beames.

Tofte claimed the elegies in *The Blazon of Iealousie* (p. 63).

I had thought for thy better contentment, to haue inserted (at the end of this Booke) the disasterous fall of three noble Romane Gentlemen, ouerthrowne thorow Iealousie, in their Loues ; but, the same was, (with Ariosto's *Satyres* (translated by mee out of Italian into English Verse, and Notes vpon the same) Printed without my consent or knowledge, in another mans name.

As far as I can discover, no originals by Ariosto exist, and Tofte's cloudy allusion just quoted gives no support to the publisher's statement that they are from Ariosto. The attribution is probably the publisher's error. While Tofte may have adapted the elegies from some other Italian author, I suspect that they are his original compositions. The laments of the three unsuccessful lovers, written in couplets, call for little comment. The first is a conventional topographical description of a mistress. The third compares a mistress to a temple.

Tofte's last book, *The Blazon of Iealousie*, owes its interest and fame to his discursive annotations. Tofte may have jotted notes

¹ An inferior translation is given by John Florio in *Florios Second Frutes*, 1591, p. 191. Tofte's version is used by Alexander Niccholes in *A Discourse of Marriage and Wiuing*, 1615 (edition of 1620, p. 10). Aside from the title, Niccholes' pamphlet shows no notable indebtedness to Tofte's *Of Mariage and Wiuing*.

² Tofte had signed himself "Il Disgratiato. R.T.G." at the end of both *Alba* and *Orlando Inamorato*.

in other volumes besides the 1561 Chaucer. Now, having served an annotating apprenticeship in *Ariosto's Satyres*, he leisurely prepared his masterpiece. On October 14, 1614, John Busby entered in the Stationers' Register "a booke called *the Blazon of Jealo[u]sie* by Robert Tofte." Tofte's dedication was dated November 7, and the quarto appeared with the date 1615. The usual initials designate the author: *The Blazon of Iealousie. A Subiect not written of by any heretofore. First written in Italian, by that learned Gentleman Benedetto Varchi, sometimes Lord Chauncelor vnto the Signorie of Venice: And Translated into English, with speciall Notes vpon the same; by R.T. Gentleman.*

Realizing the attraction of a lively title, Tofte devised his own in place of the dull original, *Lettura di M. Benedetto Varchi, sopra vn sonetto della Gelosia di Mons. Dalla Casa Fatta nella celebratissima Accademia de gl'Inflammati a Padoua*. He dedicated the book "From my Lodging in Holborne, this 7. of Nouember, 1614," to "my honourable friend, Sir Edward Dimmock Knight," reminding him of their association in Italy many years before. Sir Edward Dymoke, best known for his service as hereditary champion at the coronation of James I, was interested in Italian literature and popular English drama. To him were dedicated Samuel Daniel's version of *The Worthy tract of Paulus Iouius*, 1585, and the anonymous translation of Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*, 1602. Tofte provides the *Blazon* with a verse epistle, translates the original dedication, and adds biographical notes on Varchi and his publisher. The first of the preliminary verses is addressed by *Il Incognito* "To the Iealous Husband," and contains an allusion to Rabelais. The others are "The Censure of a Friend," *Anth.Mar.*, and a sonnet by W.L.

A recent article by my friend Mr. George M. Kahl¹ happily removes the necessity for a detailed discussion of *The Blazon*. We reached similar results before learning of each other's labours. Tofte used the pretty little Mantuan edition of 1545. He introduced occasional changes, which are listed in Mr. Kahl's systematic study, and supplied full translations of ten of Petrarch's sonnets and canzoni. The English crime to which he refers (pp. 60-61) was the notorious case of Walter Calverley, the basis of the contemporary play, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*. Popular anthologies, rather than the

¹ "Robert Tofte's Annotations in *The Blazon of Iealousie*," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, xviii. (1935), pp. 47-67.

original texts, provided most of the quotations with which Tofte filled his pithy annotations. Mr. Kahrl and I found independently that Tofte borrowed seventeen passages from *England's Parnassus*, which he mentions (p. 3), and twenty-eight from *Belvedere*. In these, as in his single poem from *The Phoenix Nest*, he made many textual changes. Mr. Kahrl has also studied the prose quotations, tracing twenty-four to *Wit's Commonwealth*. It is probable that no literary source will be found for most of the few verse passages now unidentified. Some of them are of Tofte's own composition, and others of popular origin. The quatrain beginning "Fayre and foolish, Little and loud" (p. 34), Tofte terms "our olde Said-saw here in England."¹ The verses (p. 21) beginning "To a Red man reade thy Reade" are likewise designated an "old saying."² Tofte's interesting comments on Turbervile, Gascoigne, and other writers are well known. For the sake of the annotations, the *Blazon* deserves a good modern edition.

When Robert Burton wrote the section on jealousy in *The Anatomy of Melancholy*³ he found Tofte's translation a convenient mine for quotations. Burton was ignorant of the identity of the translator; he cites the work by its title, by the name of Varchi, and by the initials R.T. The Anatomist made at least fifteen borrowings, most of them unacknowledged. He quotes from the text (including Tofte's interpolations), from Tofte's notes, from the verses in the notes, and from the commendatory verses. The *Blazon* is the unacknowledged source of such bits as a reference to Rabelais, a quotation from Wither, an Italian proverb, and passages from Propertius.

As an appendix to *The Blazon*, his most mature work, Tofte prints one of his earliest pieces as the work of a friend. In his address to the reader before *The Fruits of Iealousie* he explains that

¹ A version of the first two lines is found in [John] Florio's *Second Frutes*, 1591, p. 189. The whole, as well as the next mentioned saying, is among the manuscript poems bound with several pamphlets of amatory verse at the British Museum, press-mark C. 39. a. 37.

² Also printed in W.B., *A Helpe to Discourse*, 1619, p. 165, and thence copied into MS. Harley 1836 at the British Museum. *A Helpe to Discourse* is the direct source of thirteen epigrams and one longer poem in this manuscript, fol. 15^v-19. Unable to identify the source, A. B. Grosart reprinted six of the epigrams from the manuscript in *The Works of Sir John Davies* (Fuller Worthies' Library) with an incorrect ascription to Davies.

³ Partition III, section 3; in the first edition, 1621, pp. 662-705. Some of the borrowings have been noted by Professor Wilson in his edition of *The Batchelars Banquet*, p. xxxii.

he had intended to print the *Three Elegies* there, but that they had been pirated with *Ariosto's Satyres*.

In lieu whereof, I make bold to acquaint thee with another like Subject, of an English Gentleman, a *quondam* deare and neare friend of mine, who was so strangely possest with this Fiend *IEALOVISIE*, as (not many yeeres since) through a meere fantasticque and conceited Suspicion, after hee had long enioyed the friendship of a fayre Gentlewoman, he (on the sodaine) shooke her off, and vtterly forsooke her, sending her (for his last Farewell) this most bitter and vnkinde LETTER following, vpbrayding her with many extraordinary Courtesies done vnto her by him: which she tooke so inwardly at the Heart, as it cost her, her best life. . . .

Tofte's authorship is shown by the rime test, by telltale allusions to his Italian journey, and by the use of his nickname, Robin Red-breast, as (p. 75):

Too long thou hast on Robbins fed,
Now lothsome are those Birds so Red.

The couplet (p. 78):

Thy Belly round, the bulke of Loue,
For very grieve did pant and moue,

practically duplicates one in *Orlando Inamorato* (sig. H3). The feigned author of the poetical epistle is *R.M.*, initials suggestive of the *I.M.* and *Anth.Mar.* who supplied verses to Tofte's books. Tofte probably disavowed the authorship to obscure the identity of the characters in the poem. At the end is inscribed: "*De Mortuis nil, nisi bonum.*" From internal evidence and from Tofte's apology for the antiquated style, the composition may be dated soon after his return from Italy, or perhaps it was then revised from an earlier piece. Tofte says that when written "some (though not many) yeeres" ago, it "was well liked and much sought after."

The Fruits of Iealousie is written in sections or stanzas of six couplets, the last line of each containing a reference to the "Willow-Garland" with which the heroine had rewarded the author. The tone of the poem suggests that the mistress was not Alba, but a woman of lower station, more receptive to his suit. She was married, but the writer associated freely with her and her husband. According to the poem, the author wrote rimes in her honour, and visited Oxford with her. When she fell in a stream at Botley (Berks) while riding from London to Berkshire, the poet rescued her from drowning, in the presence of her husband (Dnabsuh). But now the

writer suspects her of infidelity. He curses her, wishes her Cressid's fate, and determines to sail on a voyage.

Aside from the letter appended to *Alba*, Tofte's only published translation from French is *Honours Academie. Or the famous pastorall, of the faire Shepheardesse, Iulietta*. The boastful title continues :

A worke admirable, and rare, Sententious and graue : and no lesse profitable, then pleasant to peruse. Wherein are many notable Discourses, as well Philosophicall, as Diuine : Most part of the Seuen Liberrall Sciences, being comprehended therein : with diuers Comickall, and Tragicall Histories, in Prose, and Verse, of all sorts. Done into English, by R.T. Gentleman. [device] Imprinted at London by Thomas Creede, 1610.

In this book alone Tofte's name appears in print ; the dedication is boldly signed *Robert Tofte*, although the epistle to the reader is endorsed with the usual *R.T.* The more than 350 folio pages prove to be a translation of only the *Cinquesme et Dernier Liure des Bergeries de Iulliette*, published at Paris in 1598. This interminable romance, written by Nicholas de Montreux under the anagram of Ollenix du Mont-Sacré, is an imitation of Montemayor's *Diana*. Tofte's translation is quite faithful, and he thoughtfully adds marginal notes such as "Simile" and "Sentence" to point out the beauties. He approached the metrical experiments of the original with zest. Numerous measures are employed in the 110 pieces, which range from some forty isolated couplets to four long tales. Some are rimeless ; some have refrains. Tofte often uses long lines, twelves and fourteeners. Stanzas of various sorts appear, a couple of sonnets, and echo-poems. There are some impossible "Examitor and Pentamitor verses" (sig. Xx4^v). The quality of the verse is low, and the riming highly defective. The work was done hurriedly, without revision.

Although published in 1610, *Honours Academie* was written years earlier. The copy was entered to Matthew Lowne on April 2, 1607, "not to be prynted without other sufficient Aucthoritye," and was assigned to Thomas Creede on November 11, 1609, as by "Jarvis Markam." In a preliminary epistle Creede declares :

This Booke hath beene kept from the Translator heereof a long time, since when (vntill it was in a manner throughlie Printed) hee neuer had sight of it, and therefore could not possiblie peruse it ouer, as his desire was, meaning to haue corrected, what you perhaps may finde amisse.

Some faults (no doubt there be) especially in the Verses, and to speake truth, how could it be otherwise, when he wrote all this Volume, (as it were) Cursorily, and in hast: Neuer hauing so much leisure, as to ouer-looke one leafe, after he had scribbled out the same.

In his verse dedication to Lady Anne Herne, Tofte writes:

Thanks yeeld I you, (the pay of younger Brother).¹

I therefore suggest that the translation was done before the death of Tofte's brother John in 1599, and that accordingly it can be dated 1598-1599. The manuscript was probably lost or stolen together with *Ariosto's Satyres*, and Tofte did not find trace of it until it was about to be published.

The Loues of Armide, Tofte's other translation from French, survives in his autograph copy in the Bodleian, MS. Rawlinson D.679. From the preliminary verses one may conclude that the undated translation was done between the deaths of Spenser and of Sir John Harington, 1599-1612. Since the verses mention only poets, it is possible that Tofte planned to convert his rough draft into verse. The crabbed handwriting of this first draft contrasts strangely with the fair copy of *A Discourse of the fiue laste Popes*. The foliation of the manuscript is 1-87, with unnumbered leaves after folios 24, 28, 37, 58, and 77. The manuscript is endorsed at the end, "By Robert Tofte Ge[nt.]" and the preliminary verses on a separate leaf are also signed. *Les Amours d'Armide*, a romance based on Tasso's epic of the crusaders, was written by Pierre Joulet, Sieur de Chatillon. It was published in 1597, and copies are now rare. The translation calls for little comment. One flagrant Gallicism appears, *Rappell* as the contrary to *Banishment* (fol. 39^v). The language does not always attain the decorum of heroic love; Tofte speaks of "a Brase of Louers," and describes kneeling Rinaldo as "vppon his Maribons" (36).

Of more general interest are Tofte's verses on a prefatory folio. They are as full of allusions to contemporary writers as the notes to *The Blazon of Iealousie*. There is a palpable hit at Anthony Munday's romances of the *Palmerin* school, but the allusion to Barten Holyday suggested by W. D. Macray² is ruled out for chronological

¹ Compare the lines in *Alba* (A6^v):

Thanks giue I; that's a yonger Brothers reward,
Nought els I haue, my Fortune is so hard.

² *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae, Pars V* (Oxford, 2186-1900), III, 430.

if not for other reasons. The right margin of the leaf is frayed, and some letters must be supplied.

To the Courteous, and Learned,
(not Captious or Ignoraunt)
Reader.

Whose reache, is shallowe, in the Foorde of Witt,
This Subiect is, (for such a one) vnfitt ;
Vnlesse, with Iudgments Eye, here on he looke,
He doth profane, not vnderstand this Booke.
No KNIGHTHOODES MIRROVR here, nor KNIGHT OF
SONN[.]

Toyes with out Art, or Witt, or Lerninge donn
-Nor shall yow (here) finde AMADIS of Gaule,
Bitter in Sense, but no thing Sweete att all.
Here ar no ranke, obscene, or lustfull wordes.
This Theame, no such Corruption base affoord,
These, ar no Lines to pore vppon for Clownes,
No Stile, of peasantes, Gulls, or boorish Lownes,
No triuiall phrase, no MOONEDAIS Vaine here lur[kes,]
These ar for HOLLIDAIS, and HIGHDAIS workes.

Sir Phill.
Sydney.
[S]ir John
Harington
Mr. Spenser.

This had a Task bin for the Muses Heire,
Deuineest SIDNEY, (phoebeus Swanne, moste faire ;)
Or, for that HARE which RINGes throwgh euerie TOWN[E]
In Iouiall Veirse, sweet poesies Renowne,
Or for that Author, of the FAIRIE QVEENE
Whose like, before or since, was neuer seene.
For him, that Title beres of prophets twaine,
And of a laureall poet, merits Name.

Samuell Daniel

Micaell
Drayton.

And lastly, (though not leste) with in my Har[t]
Our English NASO showld haue plaide this [p]ar[t,]
Who draweth pure Licor from the Muses Tun
Which, from his Braine (Parnassus like) doth ru[n,]
But since som of thes rarest Spirites be [dead,]
And those (aliue) ar (els where) busied,
Vouchsafe, that I, the Meanest of them All,
(Whose worthe (respect of theres) is very small[)]
Of yee, who Lerne be, your pardon craue
That I, this Labor vndertaken haue ;
I rather thought to venter on this Worke
Than it showld (still) in vnknownen Sylence lur[ke],
And since, for Comon Good, not priuate praise
I haue bestowed som paines, and spent som Dai[es,]
I hope, your Censures, will conceit the Best,
And what's Amiss, with Secresie, disiest.
The Multitude, and such as Ignoraunt ar,
I, By, and MAINE, from these my writings ba[r,]

Roberte Tofte

REVENGE FOR HONOUR: DATE, AUTHORSHIP AND SOURCES

BY J. H. WALTER

STUDENTS of *Revenge for Honour* have in general assumed that they are dealing with a revision by Glapthorne of an earlier play written perhaps by Chapman and based on the story of Mustapha in Knolles's *History of the Turks*. These are the conclusions reached by Parrott, who included the play in his *Tragedies of George Chapman* (New York, 1910), and they have been accepted without much question. The present writer, while preparing an edition of Glapthorne's plays, has discovered material which demonstrates that while there is little evidence in support of Parrott's theories, there is ample evidence that Chapman could not have had a hand in the play, that Glapthorne was the author not the reviser of the play, and that in the light of evidence from newly discovered parallels and sources, Knolles's *History of the Turks* can hardly be described as the main source.

Revenge for Honour was entered in the *Stationers' Register* on November 29, 1653, as the "Paraside, or Revenge for honor, by Henry Glapthorne," and in 1654 Richard Marriott published it as *Revenge for Honour. A Tragedie, by George Chapman*, an attribution repeated by Mosely in his issue of 1659. Fleay,¹ solely on the grounds of its first title in the *Stationers' Register*, suggested that *Revenge for Honour* was a revised version of a non-extant play, the *Parricide*, licensed by Herbert for the Prince's Men on May 27, 1624. He pointed out that the words in the prologue "in another Sphear" might then allude to the transference of the Prince's Company from the Curtain to the Red Bull in August 1623. Stoll,² accepting the revision theory, proposed 1621 as the earliest date for composition. He argued that the burlesque of melancholy (i. i. 99-153) alluded to Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, 1621, and that mention of the overthrow of monopolies (i. i. 149-152) referred to

¹ *Biog. Chron.*, II. 326-7.

² *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xx, No. 7, 208-9.

the cancellation of various patents on March 30, 1621. Thomas,¹ Boas,² and finally Parrott³ all agree with Fleay's theory of revision.

Strangely enough, Parrott is the only one of these writers who seems to have examined the play for traces of such a revision, and he concludes, "I doubt whether the closest analysis could distinguish the old from the new matter in this play."⁴ There is, in fact, not the slightest scrap of evidence from the text to support the revision theory: well-knit construction, uniform style, and excellent textual condition all point to the integrity of the play as it stands. Furthermore, the revision theory, while applicable to the professional dramatists attached to companies, is less applicable to an amateur gentleman dramatist like Glapthorne. He certainly made extensive revisions to his own plays and he borrowed ideas from other plays with naïve freedom, but it was not his practice to patch up old plays by other dramatists. In any case Glapthorne was a careless reviser, as the mangled and disordered texts of *Wit in a Constable* and the *Lady Mother* show, and it is inconceivable that he should have revised a play without leaving a trace.

The inferences Stoll and Fleay drew from references in the text, far from supporting a date of c. 1624 for the original composition, only confirm a later date, c. 1640. Thus the gibes at the monopolists in I. i. 147-151:

Methinks, (my Lord)

You are grown something solemn on the sudden;
Since your Monopolies and Patents, which
Made your purse swell like a wet sponge, have been
Reduc'd to th' last gasp.

are construed by Stoll and Parrott as an allusion to the attacks on monopolies by the Parliaments of 1621 and 1624. These attacks, however, were limited in scope and but partially effective, and the monopolists were certainly not reduced to their last gasp. The really effective attacks came in 1639, when Charles, on the advice of his Council, revoked a long list of patents, licences, and commissions, and in 1640, when the Long Parliament directed so vigorous and drastic an attack on these abuses that they ceased as a political grievance.⁵

¹ *Mod. Phil.*, v. 617-36.

² In his edition of *Bussy D'Ambois*, intro. viii.

³ *Tragedies of George Chapman*, p. 720.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ W. H. Price, *English Patents of Monopoly*, London, 1906, pp. 45-6.

Again, Fleay's interpretation of the prologue lines,

You've grac'd me sometimes in another Sphear,
And I do hope you'll not dislike me here,

as indicating that the company acting the play had recently changed theatres, still holds good for a later date.¹ A change-over took place at Easter, 1640, when the Prince's Company went to the Fortune and the Fortune Company (*i.e.* the Red Bull—King's Company) returned to the Red Bull, whence they had moved in 1635.² As, however, these lines might equally well refer merely to the actor speaking them and not to the company of players, this evidence can hardly be regarded as conclusive.

Inconclusive, too, is Stoll's suggestion that the burlesque of melancholy (i. i. 99-153) alluded to Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, 1621. It is by no means an unlikely suggestion, but as references to melancholy are extremely frequent in Stuart drama it would be unwise to draw any definite conclusions from it, particularly as the following evidence for a later date is so overwhelming.

The ballad mentioned in III. ii. 20-2,

Captain, I have a new one,
The Souldiers Joy 'tis call'd.
Sel. That is an harlot.

presumably refers to a ballad *The Soldier's Delight*, entered in the *Stationers' Register* March 16, 1635.³ It would seem from the reference to "a new one" in Massinger's *Unnatural Combat*, pr. 1639, III. ii. 35-6, the further entry in the *Stationers' Register*, April 24, 1640, of *The Soldiers' delight in the North*⁴ and the printing of *The Soldiers' Delight; or the She Voluntier*, 1676,⁵ that revised versions of this ballad of the female soldier were constantly being published, but no reference to any form of it earlier than 1635 has been traced.

While the evidence considered above is more consistent with a date of composition about 1640 than 1624, the following evidence from both new and old sources points more definitely to the later date.

¹ Brereton's comments on the prologue in *Elizabethan Drama: Notes and Studies*, pp. 66-7, are pointless.

² J. Q. Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses*, London, 1920, pp. 289-90.

³ Arber's *Reprint*, IV. 334.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, IV. 508.

⁵ *Roxburghe Ballads*, VII. 732-3.

The statements of Koeppel,¹ Schelling,² Parrott, and others that the Oriental theme of the play is based on the story of Solymán and Mustapha in Knolles's *History of the Turks* is supported by evidence of too general a nature to be convincing. Indeed, the author of *Revenge for Honour* could have obtained the same story from Knolles's source, Georgievits' *De Turcarum Moribus*, Goughe's translation *The Ofspring of the House of Ottomanno*, 1570 (?), or two plays based on this story, *Solymannidæ*, 1581, and Greville's *Mustapha*, c. 1609. Furthermore, the story of Mirza in Herbert's *A relation of some yeares travaile into Afrique and the greater Asia* . . . 1634, pp. 100-4, upon which Denham's *Sophy*, ac. 1641, and Baron's *Mirza*, c. 1642, were based, is somewhat similar.³ Greville's *Alaham*, 1633, and its source, Smythe's *Straunge, lamentable, and Tragicall Hystories* . . . 1577, could to a lesser degree have provided a similar story. There was, in fact, a strong tragic tradition in the popular conception of Oriental courts, and the author of *Revenge for Honour* is merely following the popular Oriental colouring of treacherous brothers, tyrannical fathers, court intrigues, and stranglings by mutes to be found in any of the above stories.

In *Revenge for Honour*, however, the peculiar non-Arabic forms of the character names, the knowledge of and attitude towards the Moors, all point to a Spanish source. At length a story containing clear and unmistakable evidence that it was the basis of *Revenge for Honour* has come to light in the *Life and Death of Mahomet, the Conquest of Spaine together with the Rysing and Ruine of the Sarazen Empire*. Written by Sr. Walter Raleigh Kt. London, . . . 1637.⁴ This is a compilation from *La verdadera historia del Rey Don Rodrigo* . . . *Nuevamente Traduzida de la lingua Arauiga por Miguel de Luna* . . . *Valencia* . . . MDCVI, which in turn purports to be drawn from two Moorish historians, Abulcacim Tarif Abentarique and Ali Abencufian. That the author of *Revenge for Honour* used the English translation and not the Spanish original is demonstrated conclusively by a curious error in the translation which is reproduced in the play. The Spanish name of the Governor of Morocco is Muça, but in the translation the name appears incor-

¹ *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, xviii, Nr. 1, 18-24.

² *Elizabethan Drama*, I, 448-9.

³ Herbert narrates even another similar story, pp. 72-82, that of Constandel chawn's murder of his father Skander and elder brother Alexander.

⁴ Raleigh does not seem to have had any hand in this work. See Oldys, *Works of Sir Walter Raleigh*, I, 459-60.

rectly as Mura on all except three occasions, where it appears correctly as Muza. *Revenge for Honour* has the form Mura throughout.

The following is a summary of the story as it appears in the *Life and Death*, pp. 188-255 :

Almanzor, growing old, resigned his offices to his elder son Abilqualit on the marriage of the latter to Omilhaire, daughter of the King of Tunis, and retired to a monastery. Abilqualit assigned the distant province of Arabia Petraea to his brother Abrahen, whose intriguing nature he feared. While Abilqualit was suppressing a rebellion Abrahen seized the throne and marched an army against Abilqualit. The latter attempted by arbitration and the offer of territory to prevent a battle, but in vain. In the ensuing battle Abilqualit was completely defeated and fled to the protection of the King of Tunis. Abrahen formally confirmed his coronation.

Abilqualit placed the forces of Mura, Governor of Morocco, and the troops lent him by the King of Tunis under the command of the experienced general Tarif and set sail for Syria. Once there he was reinforced by his supporters until his army numbered 65,000. Abrahen mustered 60,000 men by promises of rewards, but he was defeated and slain in the sanguinary battle which followed. He was buried with ceremonial pomp in the tombs of his ancestors. The general Tarif died from his wounds and was similarly buried with honour.

Mura continued to assist Abilqualit against his enemies, and after Abilqualit's death saved the heir to the throne, Jacob Almansor, from being poisoned by an ambitious regent who sent him "a rich garment imbroidered with pearle and stone artificially, and substantially poisoned." The queen-mother, acting on Mura's advice, "fastned it about a Greyhound, who in the morning was found dead swolth, and readie to burst."

It is obvious that the dramatist has made extensive alterations and additions to the original story, but this is not surprising, considering the numerous stories to which the play is indebted. Sufficient of the original has been retained—the outline of the plot, certain character names (Almanzor, Abilqualit, Abrahen, Tarifa, and Mura), the struggle between the two sons of an aged Eastern monarch for the throne, the treachery of the younger son, and possibly a hint for the poisoned handkerchief by which Abrahen

kills his father—to establish beyond doubt that the play was composed after the publication of the prose narrative in 1637.

Several writers have pointed out parallels between *Revenge for Honour* and other plays. Parrott and Beckenham¹ called attention to reminiscences of *Othello*, and Stoll showed that many threads of the plot had counterparts in *Cupid's Revenge*, 1612. To these may be added even closer parallels, not previously noted, between *Revenge for Honour* and Glapthorne's *Albertus Wallenstein*, 1639, and Carlell's *Osmond, the Great Turk*, c. 1639. If we assume for the moment that Glapthorne is the author of *Revenge for Honour*, these parallels are the more significant in helping to date the play, for they are consistent with his methods of authorship. Glapthorne uses ideas, devices, and situations from other men's plays in every one of the plays that are known to be his.² The plays from which he borrows are fashionable plays acted but a short time previously. Thus *Wit in a Constable*, c. 1637, rev. c. 1639, owes much to Davenant's *The Wits*, 1634, and Shirley's *Lady of Pleasure*, 1635; *The Hollander*, c. 1636, adapts ideas from Marmion's *A Fine Companion*, 1633, and *Holland's Leaguer*, 1632; and *Argalus and Parthenia*, c. 1633, is indebted to Hausted's *Rival Friends*, 1631. Where he is indebted to an old play, that old play had been revived. In this way *Albertus Wallenstein*, c. 1639, reveals the influence of *Julius Caesar*, which had been revived in 1637 and again in 1638. Now, of the plays to which *Revenge for Honour* has parallels, *Cupid's Revenge* was revived by Beeston's Boys on February 7, 1637,³ and *Othello* was revived at the Blackfriars on May 6, 1635, and at Hampton Court on December 8, 1636,⁴ while *Albertus Wallenstein* and *Osmond, the Great Turk* can be dated approximately 1639.⁵ *Albertus Wallenstein* is not of much value in helping to date *Revenge for Honour*; its value will appear later. There is no evidence from the text of either play to settle which dramatist is guilty of plagiarism, but if Glapthorne is the author of *Revenge for Honour* then, on the testimony of his known plays, he must at least be

¹ R.E.S., xi, No. 42, p. 198. Beckenham's contention that Glapthorne may have been an actor in the King's Company is extremely unlikely. On analogous grounds one might prove that he was an actor in at least three other companies.

² For a detailed treatment of the plays mentioned below, see my thesis *The Plays and Poems of Henry Glapthorne*, deposited in the University of London Library.

³ Malone, *Variorum*, III, 239.

⁴ Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, II, 352-3.

⁵ See the preface to Nicoll's edition, London, 1926.

regarded with suspicion. Here are the parallels between the two plays, the adulterous love episode of Orcanes and Ozaca in *Osmond*¹ and that of Abilqualit and Caropia in *Revenge for Honour*.²

Both pairs of guilty lovers are surprised by the wronged husbands. Orcanes proposes to say that he had violated Ozaca, and Abrahen, acting for Abilqualit, who has escaped, makes a similar statement. Both adulterous wives weep and beg their husbands to kill them and both are forgiven. Both wronged husbands successfully appeal for justice to the emperor, who is in both cases the father of the evil-doer. Both criminals glory in their crime and are disowned as bastards. They are both condemned to lose their sight, a punishment which will prevent their succeeding to the throne. Both confess, under different circumstances, that the woman was willing, and both are ordered to be strangled by the enraged emperor (Orcanes suffers both punishments, but Abilqualit by bribery avoids them). The parallel becomes extremely close when the gratified husbands return to break the news to their wives—Callibeus to Ozaca and Mura to Caropia. Rejoicing in their vengeance, they praise the justice of the emperor and look forward to untroubled married felicity. They both note, however, that their wives do not receive the news with joy. Ozaca and Caropia make quite certain that their lovers are dead and then :

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Ozaca</i> . . . if you had kill'd <i>Orcanes</i> yourselfe, then the revenge had stood more noble. You should have struck him thus and thus.</p> | <p>Oh husband, then the revenge <i>stabs her husband</i> <i>and her selfe.</i></p> |
|---|---|

and,

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <p><i>Caropia</i> Me thinks 't had been far nobler, had you call'd him To personal satisfaction ; had I been Your husband, you my wife, and ravished by him ; My resolution would have armed my courage To've stroke him thus : The dead Prince sends you that.</p> | <p><i>Stab him.</i></p> |
|--|-------------------------|

Both wretched women fiendishly tell their dying husbands that they were willing partners in adultery.

In short, all the evidence available from both text and source and the more doubtful testimony of parallels either points directly

¹ Pp. 27-30, 33-4, 40-4 and 50-2.

² III. i ; IV. i. ii.

to or is not incompatible with a date of composition about 1640. Now as there is not the slightest scrap of evidence of any revision, Chapman's claims to authorship must be rejected, for he died in 1634.

It now remains to examine Glapthorne's claim to be the author of the play. In the first place there is the attribution of the play to him in the *Stationers' Register*. This is less likely to be wrong than the title-page ascription to Chapman, for Marriott, the printer, would have had no motive for making a false statement before the wardens of the Stationers' Company. On the other hand, as Chapman's works were popular from 1650 to 1660,¹ the advantage of having Chapman's name on the title-page is apparent. Then the dependence of *Revenge for Honour* on other recent plays is, as has been shown, at one with Glapthorne's plagiaristic practices. Moreover, the play was composed during his period of literary activity. Finally, there is the evidence of dramatic construction and phraseology.

It is well known that Glapthorne repeats verbatim phrases and passages from his previous works whenever he is repeating an idea or a situation, a thing he frequently does. For example, he wrote an elegy on the death of his sister Priscilla in 1629 and about four years later he calmly used that elegy as Parthenia's epitaph at the end of *Argalus and Parthenia*. Other striking examples have been noted by Bullen,² Sykes,³ and Parrott. So great is the number of repetitions in *Revenge for Honour* of phrases and passages occurring in Glapthorne's known plays that it is impossible to quote them all here, or even to give an adequate summary. I can only refer to what I believe to be a fairly exhaustive list in my thesis *The Plays and Poems of Henry Glapthorne*, deposited in the University of London Library. There Glapthorne's repetitive methods are analysed in detail and are found to correspond and interrelate with those of *Revenge for Honour*: Glapthorne's peculiar vocabulary, his fondness for inverted concessive clauses, his echoing of a word or phrase in the same scene, his almost verbatim repetition of a phrase when the same thought recurs in the same play (compare I. i. 432-9 with I. i. 446-454 and IV. i. 273-5 with IV. i. 278-282), not to mention his repetitions from one play to another. Sometimes

¹ Thomas, *op. cit.*

² In his edition of the *Lady Mother* in *A Collection of O.E. Plays*, 1883, II. 101-200.

³ *Notes and Queries*, May 20, 1916, pp. 401-4.

a whole episode is repeated, though not entirely verbatim. Thus, the proxy wooing in the *Ladies' Privilege*, I. i. 306-398 and II. i. 214 *et seq.*, is used in the *Lady Mother*, IV. i. There is a similar correspondence of passage and episode in *Revenge for Honour* and *Albertus Wallenstein*, the extent of which has escaped the vigilance of previous commentators. As this is an excellent example of Glapthorne's methods, treatment in full may perhaps convince the most hardened sceptic that Glapthorne is the author of *Revenge for Honour*. If not, there is still the large bulk of remaining parallels to be found in my thesis under the above references.

There is a good deal of resemblance between the domestic relations of the austere Almanzor and his sons, Abilqualit and Abrahen, in *Revenge for Honour* and the tyrant Wallenstein and his sons, Frederick and Albertus, in *Albertus Wallenstein*. Albertus conceives an unchaste love for Isabella, a waiting-woman, but is redeemed by her purity. Frederick informs Wallenstein of Albertus' love and Wallenstein accuses the latter of degeneracy and dishonour when he expresses a wish to marry her. In the ensuing heated argument Wallenstein's fury breaks all bounds and Albertus and Isabella are slain by his command. In *Revenge for Honour* Abilqualit commits adultery with Caropia, and, through the intriguing of Abrahen, Almanzor is informed of his guilt. Almanzor delivers a long tirade against Abilqualit and orders him to be strangled, which sentence is only apparently carried out. Apart from their rank and their actions as informers, Frederick and Abrahen have little in common. In the methods and motives of his intrigue Abrahen has all the subtle villany of Lesle, the chief conspirator against Wallenstein. Both affirm their loyalty to their intended victim in the opening scene and both in soliloquy reveal their perfidious designs at the end of it: *R.H.*, I. i. 414-439; *Wall.*, II, p. 21. Both exhort their victims to rebel: *R.H.*, II. i. 289-301; *Wall.*, II, p. 19,¹ and both enumerate their accomplices and give some slight foreknowledge of their intents:

R.H., I. i. 429-434.

Then have I surly *Mura* and *Simanthes*,
My allies by my dead Mothers bloud, my assistants,
His Eunuch too *Mesithes* at my service.
Simanthes shall inform the king, the people

¹ The references are to volume and page of the Pearson Reprint of the *Plays and Poems of Henry Glapthorne*, London, 1874.

Desire Prince *Abilqualit's* stay ; and *Mura*
Whose blunt demeanour renders him oraculous,
Make a shrewd inference out of it.

Wall., II, p. 31.

. . . these two.

Shall be my agents to atchieve my ends,
Factors in cunning to vent forth my intentions,
Lieutenant Colonel *Gordon*, and my good
Captaine *Butler*.

They both regard their cunning as serpentine :

R.H., II. i. 209-10.

If I can be thus subtle
While a young serpent . . .

Wall., II, p. 21.

While untrod paths best please the subtle snake.

To gain their victim's confidence they reveal that they have been invited to conspire against him ; thus they are enabled to carry out with security the very plot they disclose. *Abrahen* tells *Abilqualit* of *Almanzor's* command :

R.H., II. i. 268-70.

Why, to me,
To me (my lord) he did with strong Injunctions
Give a solicitous charge to overlook your actions.

and later,

II. i. 276-9.

Mov'd with the base
Indignity, that he on me should force
The office of a spy ; your spy, my noble
And much lov'd brother . . .

So *Lesle*, speaking also for *Butler* and *Gordon*, tells *Wallenstein* :

Wall., II, p. 47.

Even our selves,
Our faithfull innocent selves, were those same monsters,
Design'd for to put in act his purpose (*i.e.* assassination).

But the closest parallels of all come in the fourth act of both plays where the tyrannical fathers interview their erring sons. The sequence of these parallels is remarkably close :

R.H., iv. i. 16-9.

I'll take as little notice,
Thou art my off-spring, as the wandering clouds
Do of the showers, which when they've bred to ripeness,
They straight disperse through the vast earth forgotten.

and,

Wall., II, p. 57.

I will quite put off
The name of Father, take as little notice
Thou art my off-spring, as the surly North,
Does of the snow, which when it has ingendred,
Its wild breath scatters through the earth forgotten.

R.H., iv. i. 70-9.

His (i.e. honour) was from mine derivative, as each stream
Is from its spring ; so that he has polluted
By his foul fact, my fame, my truth, my goodnesse,
Strucken through my dignitie by his violence :
Nay, started in their peaceful urnes, the ashes
Of all my glorious Ancestors ; defil'd
The memorie of their stil descendent vertues ;
Nay with a killing frost, nipt the fair blossomes,
That did presage such goodly fruit arising
From his own hopeful youth.

Wall., II, p. 58.

yong sir your honor
Is not your owne, for it you'r but my factor,
And must give me account, a strict account
Of the errors you run in : to the Dust
Of my great Ancestors, stand I accountant
For all my family, and their blest ashes
Would breake their Marble lodgings, and come forth
To quarrell with me, should I permit this bar
To staine their glorious Heraldry.

The execution of Abilqualit is precipitated by the irruption of soldiers from outside (iv. i. 181-199). Similarly the deaths of Albertus and Isabella are hastened by the intervention of the Duchess, who brings a charge of theft against Isabella (II. p. 60). Both sons protest against their father's tyranny :

R.H., iv. i. 236-7.

You'r a Tyrant,
One that delights to feed on your own bowels.

and,

Wall., II, p. 61.

you are such,
So mercilesse a tyrant, as doe love
To feed on your owne bowels.

Both tyrants suffer remorse :

R.H., IV. i. 245-252.

a sudden chillesse,
Such as the hand of winter casts on brooks
Thrills our ag'd heart. I'll not have thee ingross
Sorrow alone for *Abilqualit's* death :
I lov'd the boy well, and though his ambition
And popularitie did make him dangerous,
I do repent my furie, and will vie
With thee in sorrow.

and,

Wall., II, pp. 62-3.

twas a hopefull boy,
And one I lov'd well, till his wild love
Made him forget his duty ; and tis better
He di'd with fame, his sword in's hand, then that
He'd liv'd with foule dishonour : would he were
Alive agen, I do begin to feele
Strange horrors here, and that big guest, my soule,
Is shaken as with a nipping frost.

In spite of Oliphant's caveat¹ on the value of parallels, only Glapthorne could have had the rash effrontery to produce such damnable iteration from his own works.

The history of the play then is somewhat as follows. It was written by Glapthorne alone about 1640 or between that date and the closing of the theatres, for in 1643 Glapthorne was engaged in avoiding the consequences of having written a royalist pamphlet which gave offence to the House of Lords.² He based his plot on *The Life and Death of Mahomet*, but borrowed dramatic situations from *Cupid's Revenge*, *Albertus Wallenstein*, *Osmond*, *the Great Turk*, and possibly Oriental colouring from other plays. There is

¹ *Journal Eng. & Germ. Phil.*, xxviii, No. 1, pp. 1-15.

² *Lords' Journals*, v. 547, 596, etc. The pamphlet is in the Thomason Tracts in the British Museum and is dated by Thomason, January 11, 1642/3. It is entitled *His Maiesties Gracious Answer to The Message sent from the Honourable Citie of London, concerning Peace . . . Printed at London for Thomas Massam, 1643.*

no record that the play was licensed by Herbert, but it may have been acted before the closing of the theatres, as there are indications in the text that the printer set up his type from the prompt-copy. Marriott entered it in the *Stationers' Register* in 1653 as by Glapthorne and published it the next year as by Chapman. It is not certain whether Marriott was guilty of deliberate fraud or whether, as Dr. Greg suggests, the compositor actually misread the name Glapthorn(e) and set up Chapman instead. It was one of the plays assigned to Davenant on August 20, 1668, to be performed by the Duke of York's Company,¹ and we last hear of the play from Langbaine, who wrote in 1691, "This play I have seen acted many years ago at the *Nursery in Barbican*."²

¹ Nicoll, *Restoration Drama*, p. 315.

² *English Dramatic Poets*, p. 64.

CORPSES, CONCEALMENTS, AND CURTAINS ON THE RESTORATION STAGE

BY WILLIAM S. CLARK

IN 1664, when the London playhouses were once again running full-blast after their long cessation, Richard Flecknoe, that pedantic prince of dullness ridiculously immortalised in Dryden's devastating satire, published a brief treatise on matters theatrical under the title *A Short Discourse of the English Stage*. Throughout his hodge-podge of criticism and reminiscence Flecknoe broke forth into words of praise for the contemporary stage on only one occasion. At that significant point he took pains to remark, with the misguided enthusiasm so characteristic of believers in material luxury as a sign of artistic achievement, that the English theatres "of former times were but plain and simple . . . whereas ours now for cost and ornament are arriv'd to the heighth of Magnificence." In this patronising assertion he was but echoing the prevailing pride of the theatre-goers in Restoration London. Every visitor, whether French or native, to the playhouses erected in the English metropolis since the return of Charles II thought them the last word in theatrical planning and splendour. One and all were exhilarated by the conviction that the new day in the life and culture of the nation had even extended to the theatre and had produced there a glorious freshness of stage presentation.

The novelty of the new "picture-stage" and the brilliance of its subsidiary architectural adornments largely blinded the eyes of the theatre-going laymen to the extensive imitation from Elizabethan and Caroline days still observable in the stage arrangements of the recently constructed playhouses. Painted scenery and more decorative properties undoubtedly brought about a great change in the visual effect of performances, but most of the stage contrivances and mechanical conventions still harked back to practices of the earlier seventeenth century. These Restoration elaborations or modifications of Elizabethan example have been generally

recognized and described by stage historians in late years. Nevertheless, one of the most interesting survivals from the parental English theatre has continued entirely to escape notice. On the platform-stage there had hung between the main acting platform and the inner stage a pair of curtains, also referred to in stage directions as the "hangings," the "arras," or the "traverse." This stage traverse when drawn open served to discover scenes or persons on the inner stage and when drawn close, to afford a place of hiding for spies or eavesdroppers. It has long been known as an extremely important adjunct of Elizabethan dramaturgy, and yet no explicit attention has ever been given to its subsequent fate. Apparently the stage historians have assumed in silence that when the "picture-stage," with its "apron," proscenium curtain, and scene flats, was introduced after the Restoration, the old traverse disappeared from the new stage set-up. As a matter of fact, however, it did not pass into oblivion, but remained a regular fixture with the same essential functions. Its employment, to be sure, became less frequent than on the platform-stage, because the movable scene flats were utilised on a majority of the occasions where formerly the traverse alone had been available. Yet to the playwrights of the new age this traverse did offer a desirable alternative in not a few instances, a flexible and vivid means of discovery or concealment. Consequently it exerted at many points a decided influence upon Restoration dramaturgy, an influence which has never been appreciated.

Definite intimations of the location and working of this traverse on the Restoration stage may be gathered from Act v of Dryden's *The Duke of Guise* (D.G., 1682). The stage business in the final moments of this play is most colourful, but so complicated that one who is unfamiliar with the sometimes grotesque conventions of Restoration scene-shifting is easily led astray by the directions in the text.¹ The third "scene" of the fifth act represents the "Council-hall" of the royal palace in Paris. Then "*The Scene draws ; behind it, a Traverse.*"² When the flats are thus drawn apart, the site of action is supposed to change to an antechamber. With this change of scene the location of the council hall must be imagined as moved upstage behind the traverse, which now stands

¹ Cf. R. W. Lowe's misconceptions in his *Life of Thomas Betterton*, pp. 44-5.

² Q 1683, p. 75, reads: "*The Scene draws behind it a Traverse.*" The printer has obviously botched the punctuation of this direction, which is nonsensical as it stands. Yet it has been thus reproduced by all subsequent editors.

as a curtained partition between the hall and the antechamber. Into the antechamber enters the Duke of Guise and "*is assaulted by Eight, They stab him in all parts, but most in the head.*"¹ Within a brief space the Duke dies, whereupon "*The Traverse is drawn. The King rises from his Chair, comes forward with his Cabinet Council.*"² When the traverse draws open, the scene is intended to shift, for a short interval, from the antechamber located toward the fore-stage to the "Council-hall" deep upstage, where the King is revealed sitting in state and surrounded by his council. As the King walks forward, *i.e.* downstage, he is conceived to be going into the antechamber, which he supposedly lays open to the sight of the council, though actually it is already in plain view for both actors and audience. There, in the presence of the Guise's corpse, all this while exposed, the King carries on the final dialogue of the play and points directly to the dead body as evidence of his unshaken will.

The traverse which plays so vital a part in this closing action of *The Duke of Guise* can be located with almost complete certainty if the scene changes of the fifth act are carefully noted. Three "scenes," presumably all "flat scenes," are shifted on and off before the traverse is disclosed. Hence, when the traverse is finally drawn, there probably appears the very upper end of the "House," terminated by a "back scene" in front of which is set the chair of state occupied by the King. From this evidence the traverse would seem to be situated somewhere between the "back scene" and the main group of scene flats, in all likelihood just behind the last pair of flats upstage. That such was regularly its precise location is borne out by numerous other situations wherein the traverse occurs. For example, Act v of Ravenscroft's *Titus Andronicus* (D.L., 1686) affords quite definite implications. At first the scene is a flat depicting a chamber or gallery in the royal palace. Then the "*Scene draws and discovers a Banquett.*"³ During the banquet Titus commands, "Draw back that Screen" and at once there appears "*The Moor discover'd on a Rack.*"⁴ Soon thereafter Titus remarks "Empress, behold," at which line "*A Curtain drawn discovers the heads and hands of Dem[etrius] and Chir[on] hanging up against the wall. Their Bodys in Chairs in bloody Linnen.*"⁵ The curtain here must be deep upstage, for it obviously hangs to

¹ Q 1683, p. 75.⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 53.² *Ibid.*³ Q 1686, p. 52.⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

the rear of the screen and the rack, both of which are presumably located behind the banquet-table and guests. On the other hand, the curtain is far enough in front of the "back scene" (which is a "wall" decorated with mangled limbs) to permit the arrangement of chairs and corpses behind the curtain before it is drawn aside. The evidence points therefore to the same location as that of the traverse in *The Duke of Guise*, i.e. immediately behind the innermost pair of scene shutters.

The stage directions in these scenes of *The Duke of Guise* and of *Titus Andronicus* do not make absolutely clear the exact nature of the Restoration traverse, though they imply that, like its Elizabethan forerunner, it moved to and from the side of the stage, rather than rose and fell like the proscenium curtain. Other Restoration references offer more exact details on this point and show that the traverse was composed of curtains which came together at the centre of the stage and shut off the extreme rear of the "House." In Act V of Lee's *Cæsar Borgia* (D.G., 1679) Borgia plans to horrify Bellamira with a glimpse of the murdered rebels and commands Alonzo :

Go, draw the Curtain ; glut her eyes with Death . . .
Draw, draw the Curtain.¹

At once "Orsin. Vitelloz. D. Graviana, Oliveretto, *appear disguised*."² After a considerable exposure of the disfigured corpses Borgia's secretary, Machiavel, orders Don Michael to dispose of the bodies. The last line of his order is followed by the stage direction, "*Draw here the Curtains on 'em*."³ The wording of this direction is clearly intended to describe the actual manner of the theatre production. It is an interesting revelation of the fact that the inner curtain called for by the play-text was, on the stage itself, really a pair of curtains which shut off the rear portion of the "House" when they were drawn together in the middle of the stage.

Further proof of the traverse's form lies in the third act of Crowne's *The Destruction of Jerusalem*.⁴ The Part I (D.L., 1676). opening scene of that act represents the court of the Temple at Jerusalem, and calls for partly drawn shutters arranged as side-wings. The space between the wings at the rear is closed in by the traverse which serves as the veil before the "oracle" or "holy of

¹ Q 1680, p. 57.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

⁴ Q 1677, p. 25.

holies." Suddenly "*The Vale flies open, and shews the Sanctum Sanctorum,*" while at the same time Matthias exclaims, "But oh! retire, the sacred Curtain tears."¹ The rending of the sacred veil makes it patent that the traverse was really a pair of curtains, easily and quickly parted to the sides of the stage when the occasion demanded. After this same manner also, the Elizabethan "arras" had been constructed before the inner stage.

The "discovery" of dead bodies, as the foregoing instances have perhaps suggested, was the most common role of the traverse in Restoration tragedy.² An example of this conventional use, which, however, is accompanied by rather an unusual setting, exists in Act v of Settle's *Love and Revenge* (D.G., 1675). The scene is a prison, where Nigrello is about to murder the King, but the villain must first offer the monarch a bit of entertainment. Upon Nigrello's words

But King, before thou dyest
He shew thee my Experience in Murder.

there is "*A Curtain drawn, Claremount and Fredigond appear dead.*"³ The walls of the prison probably were represented by partially drawn flats, while the traverse closed in the vista. Then, on the drawing of the curtains, the "back scene" became visible as the rear wall of the prison, in front of which two corpses doubtless were suspended from a rack, if rack and corpses were not painted figures on the "back scene."

On seemingly very rare occasions the Restoration traverse, unlike the Elizabethan, might accomplish the concealment of dead bodies without a previous discovery. The sole known record of this Restoration development occurs, however, not in a printed text, but in the two extant manuscripts of the Earl of Orrery's *Tryphon* (T.R., 1668). The last scene of Act v presents the royal audience chamber, a scene evidently composed of wings and a back flat. In front of the "back scene" rises "*an elevated Place like a Throne,*"

¹ Q 1677, p. 25.

² An erroneous citation of "discovery" by curtain occurs in Hazelton Spencer's *Shakespeare Improved*, p. 312. After a mistaken reference to Crowne's *The Misery of Civil War*, Act iv, instead of Crowne's *Henry the Sixth*, Act iv, the statement is made that a curtain was drawn to expose the strangled body of Gloucester. Yet the stage direction in question reads: "*The Scene is drawn, and the Duke of Gloucester is shewn dead in a chair*" (*Henry the Sixth*, Q 1680, p. 57).

³ Q 1675, p. 80.

where Tryphon, on seating himself, commits suicide with a poniard. Arcas, his servant, follows suit and falls at his master's feet. Stratonice, along with other courtiers, enters, and after gazing upon the dead Tryphon, says to Seleucus :

Sir, let his Body be from hence convey'd ;
He by his Death for all his Crimes has paid.

At this last line MS. Malone 11 inserts the direction, " A Curtaine is drawn afore the dead bodyes," while MS. Rawl. poet. 39 reads, " A Curtaine is drawn before Tryphon and Arcas." Thus the two corpses are swiftly removed from the scene by the simple expedient of drawing closed the traverse, ideally located for this purpose between Tryphon's throne and the wing flats. The far end of the " House " is thereby shut off, and the action continues uninterrupted in the royal apartments, from which the unpleasant signs of bloodshed have been altogether obliterated. It is hard to understand why this convenient and effective method for the disposal of undesired corpses was not more commonly practised by Restoration playwrights.

Numerous " discoveries " not only of corpses but of other spectacles in Restoration tragedy were undoubtedly accomplished through the employment of the traverse and yet not preserved in the printed play texts. The quartos of the Restoration period for the most part are notably careless or scanty in their directions, and by no means describe all the details of stage production. At the opening of Act v in Banks' *The Destruction of Troy* (D.G., 1678), "*Scene opens to a Temple.*"¹ A short while after, "*SCENE opens, and discovers Cassandra in a distracted posture . . . catching hold of several Trojans that pass hastily to and fro the Streets. . .*"² Finally comes the brief and cryptic direction, "*The great Horse discover'd.*"³ The " great Horse " is supposedly being pulled through the streets of Troy. It would be a most awkward arrangement if a pair of flats picturing a street, or piazza, or the like were used as a background to the scene of Cassandra's distraction and were then drawn off so that the horse might appear upstage. By that artifice the scenic picture would be broken and yet the locale must be imagined to remain unchanged. More likely, therefore, Cassandra moved wildly about in front of the traverse, which was drawn at the proper moment to reveal the " great Horse." The

¹ Q 1679, p. 60.

² *Ibid.*, p. 63.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

latter may have been either an actual figure on the stage or a painted image on the "back scene."

A situation with the like intriguing uncertainty as to its staging arises in Settle's *The Heir of Morocco* (D.L., 1694), Act v, where the King has Altomar strung up in the palace hall on a gibbet which at first is concealed from the view of both actors and audience. After considerable conversation the King says to the foreign envoy present, "See there that Glorious Sun is set for ever,"¹ and then, turning to his attendants, commands

Haste; take that Sacred Martyr from the Wrack:
Be quick ye Slaves.

This command is followed immediately by the stage direction, "They cut him down, and set him on a Chair."² It is obvious that Altomar's corpse has somehow been "discovered," though the text gives no indication of such stage business. It cannot be said with certainty whether the "discovery" was by the drawing of the traverse or by the opening of scene flats. Yet, in view of the scenic circumstances, the use of the curtain seems the more artistically appropriate and feasible, even from the Restoration point of view. At any rate, in such cases as these the drawing of scene flats cannot be taken for granted, as is done by Miss Lily B. Campbell's discussion of Restoration "discoveries" in her *Scenes and Machines on the English Stage during the Renaissance*. She simply assumes that the "discovery" of Malignii's corpse in Act v of Porter's *The Villain* (L.I.F., 1662) was brought about by the opening of the "scene." Yet the stage direction only states: "Malig. discover'd pierc't with a stake."³ Absolutely no other clue of stage procedure is available. In a Restoration scene of this nature, where no precise method of "discovery" is hinted, the use of the traverse must be considered at least a reasonable possibility.

Gruesome though the usual roles of the traverse were amid the villainy and bloodshed of Restoration tragedy, in the comedies it played far more pleasant and varied parts. Its primary function in the lighter drama was to provide a hiding-place, just as it did so frequently on the Elizabethan stage. In Aphra Behn's *The Feigned Curtezans* (D.G., 1679) the second scene of Act iv takes place in a "Bed-chamber Alcove" at night. The traverse is obviously

¹ Q 1694, p. 43.

² *Ibid.*

³ Q 1663, p. 94.

drawn closed to form the back part of the chamber scene. Philipa says to Sir Signal, who hears pursuers :

Here, step behind this Hanging—There's a Chimney which may shelter ye till the Storm be over—if you be not smother'd before.

She then, according to the stage direction, "*puts him behind the Arras.*" Very soon Sir Signal, hearing his name mentioned by newcomers to the chamber, parts the "Arras" where it meets at the centre of the stage and peeps "*out of the Chimney, his Face blackt.*" Again, a little later, he peeps out, "*with a Face more smuttet,*" to use the words of the stage direction. Finally, when his pursuers are quite gone, Sir Signal "*peeps and then comes out*" from between the hangings.

The traverse appears a prominent device in another bedroom situation where the circumstances are somewhat reversed. The second scene of Act iv in Congreve's *The Double Dealer* (D.L., 1693) "shews Lady Touchwood's Chamber," the rear of which is obviously closed in by the traverse. Mellefont enters alone, with the intention of spying on her ladyship. After remarking "Oh that her Lord were but sweating behind the Hanging, with the Expectation of what I shall see," he "*goes behind the Hanging.*"¹ Lady Touchwood and Maskwell then enter and carry on a *tête-à-tête* which grows more and more warm. Finally Mellefont can stand the situation no longer; he "*leaps out*"² from behind the traverse—at the juncture of the curtains, of course—and, after a few wild words, rushes off the stage.

Even in comedy, this inner curtain might occasionally become an agency for weird and solemn effects. The opening scene of the fourth act in Maidwell's *The Loving Enemies* (D.G., 1679) is laid in a chamber of Antonio's house at night. Antonio and Lucinda plan to deceive Paulo, a credulous dolt, by showing him a supposed statue of his friend Antonio. Actually the statue is Antonio himself. It may be inferred from the very scanty stage directions that the statue is placed behind the traverse in the relatively dim light of upstage during a "dark scene."

Paulo. Let me but see my old Friend's Statue first.

Lucin. I'll draw the Curtain; are you ready, Antonio?

Anto. within. I am.

Eerie noises arise and the candles in the chamber burn blue as the

¹ Q 1694, p. 59.

² *Ibid.*, p. 60.

traverse is drawn open to reveal the statue. Lucinda helps to increase the tension of the situation and to befuddle the now perturbed Paulo by crying out, "Heaven, what will become of us!" Then Paulo boldly says, "I will turn the Statue," and evidently goes upstage to lay hands on it. On nearer approach he exclaims, startled, "the Statue stirs" and runs off in a fright.

Perhaps the most amusing employment of the traverse in Restoration comedy took place during Act II of Aphra Behn's *The Emperor of the Moon* (D.G., 1687). The third scene "*changes to the Inside of the House*" of Scaramouch. The stage direction explains that "*the Front of the Scene is only a Curtain or Hangings, to be drawn up at Pleasure.*" Further upstage, however, as the directions later show, the regular traverse has been drawn together to suggest a tapestry background to the house interior. There enter various ladies and gentlemen "*dress'd in Masking Habits*" or in "*Gothic Habits*," along with "Scaramouch, Harlequin, and Musick." Scaramouch "*goes with all the company behind the Front Curtain. Scaramouch having plac'd them all in the Hanging, in which they make the Figures, where they stand without Motion in Postures, he comes out.*" In other words, Scaramouch takes his actors upstage to the regular traverse, and, amid its folds, places his gaily attired company so that they will appear as the fantastic figures in a great tapestry, when viewed by the moon-struck doctor upon his entrance shortly afterwards. As soon as the doctor comes in, the front "*Curtain is drawn up, and discovers the Hangings, where all of them [i.e. the persons placed by Scaramouch] stand.*" The Doctor "*Looks on the Hangings*" and is amazed at the tapestried figures. During his closer inspection of the tapestry he receives from Harlequin several knocks on the head, and finally runs out. Then the creators of the mock patterns "*come out of the Hanging, which is drawn away.*" This "Hangings Scene," as it commonly was called, became one of the outstanding Restoration comic situations. It illustrates a use of the traverse which it would have been impossible to carry out on the Elizabethan stage. Thus in comedy as in tragedy Restoration playwrights occasionally did blaze a new trail with the mechanism of the traverse, but their innovations were certainly few in proportion to the possible opportunities.

The traverse which hung just behind the main series of flats as a regular stage fixture is not to be confused with certain special curtains rigged up now and then on the Restoration stage to meet the

peculiar scene requirements of a particular play. An excellent example of the special curtain may be noted in Ravenscroft's *The Italian Husband* (L.I.F., 1697). During the third act Alfonso is to be murdered in the palace hall. Just after he cries out, "Mercy! mercy! Oh! Oh!" "*A little Silk Curtain falls to screen him, that hung ruffled above his Head.*"¹ In a moment "*they draw up the Curtain. Alfonso appears murder'd.*"² The curtain here utilized is plainly a single hanging of small dimensions, probably fastened to a canopy of some sort, and it rolls up rather than draws to the side. A curtain of a very similar kind makes its appearance in Act III of Wycherley's *Love in a Wood* (T.R., 1671). The scene is "Cross-bite's Dining-Room." The stage set obviously displays a closet cupboard shut off by a small curtain. Gripe enters alone and says, "I look for a private place to retire to, in time of need; oh, here's one convenient. (*Turns up a Hanging, and discovers the slender provisions of the Family.*)" Here is merely a small hanging fastened to a flat, one which, of course, bears no relation to the hangings of the regular traverse.

The incongruous spectacle of this tapestry traverse amid the flats and scenery of the Restoration "picture-stage" constitutes one of the most curious heritages from the Elizabethan theatre. Its presence in the new playhouses of the Restoration age perhaps may have been due in part to the existence of a similar fixture on contemporary European stages. Certain of the German theatres, at least, possessed such a traverse in the mid-seventeenth century. A Strasburg engraving of 1655 shows a German stage with the scenic arrangements in place.³ The "scene" within the proscenium consists of four sets of architectural wings on either side of the "House." These wings frame a vista painted on a back flat at the rear. Behind the fourth row of wings on each side may be seen the ends of a drawn curtain, a curtain which when closed would shut off the entire stage from top to bottom and side to side. Of identical form and location was the inner curtain on the London stages of Restoration vintage.

There it hung in the dimmer recesses of the "House," ready to

¹ Q 1698, p. 35.

² *Ibid.*

³ See in Joseph Gregor's *Wiener szenische Kunst. Theaterdekoration* (1924), p. 13, the plate entitled "Strassburg 1655. Titelpuffer die 'Deutscher Schaubühnen I. Theyl.'" This plate is reproduced in Allardyce Nicoll's *The Development of the Theatre*, p. 165, Fig. 196.

serve the harassed fancy of the Restoration playwright in his search for telling devices : an effective mask, easily removed and as easily replaced, for the horrible murders of tyrants and villains ; a striking agency for the exposure of supernatural happenings ; an accessible haven of concealment for pranksters or evil-doers, for pursued or pursuing—these and other odd services were asked of the faithful traverse. However humble its roles, its influence upon Restoration dramaturgy proved widespread and important. And since the theatre has always been notoriously slow to divest itself of useful devices for the business of illusion, the back-stage curtain had the hour of decease long postponed. The eighteenth century was well begun before the London playhouses folded up their tapestry traverses and laid them away for good and all.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

PARALLEL PASSAGES IN BACON AND FULLER

THERE are several passages in the writings of Fuller to which parallels can be found in Bacon's works. As only one of these seems to have been noticed, a list of some of them may, perhaps, be found useful.

In Bacon's *Advertisement touching an Holy War*, Martius, one of the persons of the dialogue, speaks of the Turkish Empire :

A cruel tyranny, bathed in the blood of their emperors upon every succession ; a heap of vassals and slaves ; no nobles, no gentlemen, no freemen, no inheritance of land, no stirp of ancient families . . . a nation without morality, without letters, arts or sciences ; that can scarce measure an acre of land or an hour of the day.

With this may be compared Fuller's description of the same Empire in the fifth book of the *Holy War* :

In a word, it is a cruel tyranny, bathed in the blood of their Emperors upon every succession ; a heap of vassals and slaves ; no Nobles (except for time being, by office) no Gentlemen, no Free-men, no inheritance of land, no Stirp or ancient families ; a nation without any morality, arts and sciences, that can scarce measure an acre of land or hour of a day.

The following are taken from Bacon's *Essays* and from Fuller's *Holy State* respectively :

Bacon, " Of Parents and Children " :

The illiberality of parents in allowance towards their children, is a harmful error, makes them base, acquaints them with shifts, makes them sort with mean company, and makes them surfeit more when they come to plenty.

Fuller, " The Good Parent " :

*He allows his children maintenance according to their quality.*¹—Otherwise, it will make them base, acquaint them with bad company and sharking tricks ; and it makes them surfeit the sooner when they come to their estates.

¹ The italics, in all quotations, are from the original.

In the same essays, both Bacon and Fuller say that the disinheriting of the eldest son of a family brings misfortune, and they give similar precepts for the choice, by parents, of a profession for their children.

Bacon, "Of Marriage and Single Life" :

Unmarried men are . . . not always best subjects, for they are light to run away, and almost all fugitives are of that condition.

Fuller "Of Marriage" :

Thus married men, especially if having posterity, are the deeper sharers in that State wherein they live ; which engageth their affections to the greater loyalty.

Bacon "Of Atheism" :

It is true, that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion.

This is closer to Fuller's words than the similar passage in the "Advancement of Learning," Book I.

Fuller, "The True Church Antiquary" :

Indeed, *a little skill* in antiquity inclines a man to Popery ; but *depth in that study* brings him about again to our religion.

Bacon, in "Of Atheism," says that one of the causes of atheism is the :

custom of profane scoffing in holy matters, which doth by little and little deface the reverence of religion.

Fuller, in "The Atheist," says that the potential atheist *scoffs and makes sport at sacred things*. This by degrees abates the reverence of religion, and ulcers men's hearts with profaneness.

In their essays on atheism both Bacon and Fuller say that the "contemplative atheist" is rare, mention Diagoras and Lucian as examples, refer to prosperity and to religious dissensions as causes of atheism, and regard the existence of God as self-evident and the atheist as really unconvinced.

Bacon, "Of Plantations" :

I like a plantation in a pure soil ; that is, where people are not dis-planted to the end to plant in others ; for else it is rather an extirpation than a plantation. . . .

It is a shameful and unblessed thing to take the scum of people and wicked condemned men to be the people with whom you plant. . . .

Fuller, "Of Plantations" :

And such a place will thrive the better . . . when new Colonies come not in with extirpation of the Natives ; for this is rather a Supplanting than a Planting. . . .

Let the planters be honest, skilful, and painful people. For if they be such as leap thither from the gallows, can any hope for cream out of scum ?

In the essays they both advocate commercial privileges for a new colony, and recommend that, in their dealings with the savages, the "planters" should be fair but cautious.

Bacon, in "Of Judicature," says that a judge should suppress contentious suits, which ought to be spewed out, as the surfeit of courts. . . .

In causes of life and death, judges ought (as far as the law permitteth) in justice to remember mercy. . . .

Let not the counsel at the bar . . . wind himself into the handling of the cause anew after the judge hath declared his sentence.

Fuller, in "The Good Judge," says that he causeth that contentious suits be spewed out, as the surfeits of courts. . .

When he sits upon life, in judgment he remembereth mercy. . . .

He silences that Lawyer who seeks to set the neck of a bad cause, once broken with a definitive sentence.

They both maintain that a judge should not anticipate the evidence of a witness, and that he should always consider the Law in relation to what Fuller calls "Rules of State."

Bacon, "Of Anger" :

To extinguish anger utterly is but a bravery of the Stoics. We have better oracles : Be angry, but sin not : let not the sun go down upon your anger. . . .

To contain anger from mischief . . . there be two things whereof you must have special caution . . . that in anger a man reveal no secrets ; for that makes him not fit for society. The other, that you do not peremptorily break off in any business in a fit of anger ; but howsoever you show bitterness, do not act anything that is not revocable.

Fuller, "Of Anger" :

Take heed of doing irrevocable acts in thy passion. As the revealing of secrets, which makes thee a bankrupt for society ever after ; neither do such things which done once are done for ever, so that no bemoaning can amend them.

Their essays on travel also have much in common. They both

advise a traveller to learn foreign languages before going abroad, to avoid his own countrymen while travelling, to maintain a correspondence abroad after his return, not to talk too readily about his experiences, and, as we should expect, not to affect foreign fashions. Lastly, as was remarked by J. E. Bailey in his *Life of Fuller*, their remarks about jokes are very similar (see Bacon, "Of Discourse"; and Fuller, "Of Jestings").

In the *Church History of Britain* there are several echoes from Bacon's *Henry VII*. The concluding paragraph of the latter work is as follows :

He was born at Pembroke Castle, and lieth buried at Westminster, in one of the stateliest and daintiest monuments of Europe, both for the chapel and for the sepulchre. So that he dwelleth more richly dead in the monument of his tomb, than he did alive in Richmond or any of his palaces. I could wish he did the like in this monument of his fame.

Fuller's last words on Henry VII are :

It is questionable whether his body lies in more magnificence in that stately and costly tomb and chapel of his own erecting, or whether his memory lives more lastingly in that learned and curious history which the lord Bacon hath written of his reign.

In the same paragraph he repeats Bacon's erroneous statement that Henry died in 1508, but this may come from Speed.

In the following instance Fuller acknowledges that he is quoting from Bacon, who has :

The King began also then, as well in wisdom as in justice, to pare the privilege of clergy ; ordaining that clerks convict should be burned in the hand,—both because they might taste of some corporal punishment, and that they might carry a brand of infamy.

Fuller :

To the dissolute and vicious clergy he was justly severe, and pared their privileges, ordaining that clerks convict should be burned in the hand ;¹ both that they might taste a corporal punishment, and carry a brand of infamy.

On another occasion Fuller seems to be guilty of positive inaccuracy. Bacon writes of the failure of the project to canonize Henry VI :

But it is more probable that that Pope, who was extremely jealous of the dignity of the see of Rome and of the acts thereof, knowing that King

¹ Lord Verulam in *Henry VII*, p. 66.

Henry the Sixth was reputed in the world abroad but for a simple man, was afraid it would but diminish the estimation of that kind of honour, if there were not a distance kept between innocents and saints.

Fuller quotes Bacon as saying, "the Pope would put a difference betwixt a Saint and an Innocent." He is apparently punning on the name of Pope Innocent VIII, who is often mentioned in Bacon's work. The Pope to whom Bacon refers in this instance is, however, not Innocent, who died in 1492, but Julius II (1503-1513). It is also noticeable that Fuller states that Henry and the Papal Legate divided the money raised in England by the sale of Indulgences, an accusation disproved by Bacon.

In view of the neglect of Bacon by the more liberal clergy of the seventeenth century (by the Cambridge Platonists, for instance), it is interesting to find that Fuller was so careful a reader of his works. The inaccuracies mentioned above suggest that some of his quotations were made from memory. If so, it proves that he followed his own advice to readers: "Proportion an hour's meditation to an hour's reading of a staple author."

C. F. BECKINGHAM.

THE ELIZABETHAN LICENSER OF "COPY" AND HIS FEE

ALTHOUGH it is well known that the Master of Revels in Shakespeare's time charged for his licence of plays for the press as well as for the stage,¹ and that the wardens of the Stationers' Company charged sixpence for their authorization, the general belief is, I believe, that the official licensors did not require payment for their services. Pollard has written:

We have no record of any fee having to be paid for a licence, although the poor devil whose book was considered doubtful very probably had to spend much money on porters and ushers before he could get a licence from headquarters.²

Yet, by analogy with the Master of Revels, one would assume that official licensors were remunerated, that the stationer paid the bishop, chaplain, or prebendary a certain sum for the latter's perusing

¹ *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, Cornell Studies in English III., ed. J. Q. Adams (Yale University Press, 1917), pp. 23-42, *passim*.

² *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* (London, 1909), p. 5.

and allowing the copy submitted to him. There is, fortunately, proof for this position in the records of the Stationers' Court. On March 1, 1602, the Court came to the following decision concerning a dispute among Waterson, Pavier, and Hardy :

Yt is ordered that mr waterson shall pay x s vnto Tho pavier for his clayme to the Irish newes and that Io hardy shall stand discharged from Tho pavier of the x s wch the seid Tho pavier delyu'ed to hym to pcure the Authourisinge of the said copie.¹

Since the "copy" had been entered on January 22 "vnder the handes of my Lord Bysshop of London and Master Seaton warden" (Arber, III. 200), at the usual fee of sixpence, it is apparent that the ten shillings mentioned in the Court order *must* apply to the official allowance.

And that the official licenser was paid for the licence which he granted is also indicated by some excerpts from the office-book of Sir Henry Herbert, excerpts *which do not apply to plays*. I quote from J. Q. Adams' "notices of Herbert's licences for the press as cited from his office-book by Malone and Chalmers" :²

And, the master of the Revels appears also to have licensed books, during the reigns of King James, and Charles the 1st; he received a fee, for allowing Ovid's *Epistles*, translated into English; he received a fee, for a book of verses of my Lord Brook's, called *Coelia*; he received of Sayle, the Bookbinder, *ten* shillings, for allowing to be printed two other small pieces of verses, done by a boy of thirteen, called *Cowley*. (Chalmers, *A Supplementary Apology for the Believers in the Shakespeare-Papers* (London, 1799), pp. 209-10.)

Immediately after this entry is another : . . . Received from Henry Seyle for allowinge a booke of verses of my Lord Brooks, intituled *Religion, Humane Learning, Man, and Honor*, this 17 of October 1632, in mony, 1*l.* 0*s.* 0*d.* in books to the value of 1*l.* 4*s.* 0*d.* . . .

¹ *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1576-1602*, ed. W. W. Greg and E. Boswell (London, 1930), p. 85.

² *Dramatic Records*, p. 41. At the Restoration Herbert tried to re-establish not only his authority to license plays for the stage but also his authority to license plays and poems for the press. His deputy, Edward Hayward, composed a document entitled "Arguments to prove that the Master of his Maiesties Office of Revels, hath not only the power of Lycencing all plays, Poems, and ballads, but of appoynting them to the Press" (*ibid.*, pp. 125-6). And in Hayward's "Remembrances when I waite vpon Sir Henry Herbert," dated July 27, 1663, we read "To be informed by Sir Henry, whether it Doth not as equally belong to him to Lycence all Poems and Ballads as play bookes, which I may not omit to enquire after, for the enlarging and extending of my profits . . ." (*ibid.*, p. 127). Certainly Hayward was under no doubts as to whether or not a licenser for the press was paid for his services.

The subsequent entry ascertains the date of Cowley's earliest production:

More of Seyle, for allowinge of two other small peeces of verses for the press, done by a boy of this town called Cowley, at the same time, *ol. 10s. od.* (Third Variorum, III. 231.)¹

This is not much evidence, it is true, but it is enough to demand that those who hold the opposite view (*i.e.* that the Censor who licensed books for the press was *not* paid for his pains) supply some evidence to substantiate that view.

LEO KIRSCHBAUM.

THE DATING OF ROCHESTER'S "SCAEN"

Two of Rochester's editors, Professor Prinz² and, more recently, Professor Pinto,³ have assigned the fragment "A Scaen from Sir Robert Hoard's Play by the Earl of Rochester"⁴ to 1672. Presumably following Prinz's suggestion, Pinto states that Howard "seems to have planned this 'heroic' play in 1672, but laid it aside when Elkanah Settle produced a tragedy with the same title [*The Conquest of China, by the Tartars*] in 1673/74."⁵ In his Chronology, Pinto definitely assigns Rochester's writing of the scene to the summer of 1672.⁶

This date is, to say the least, highly conjectural. All we know of Howard's unfinished play we learn from a letter by Dryden to his sons, dated September 3, 1697. The poet said: "After my

¹ We can check Herbert's office-book by the Stationers' Registers. On November 10, 1632 (Arber, IV. 288) we find that Seile "Entered for his Copy vnder the hands of Sir Henry Herbert and Master Aspley warden a booke called *Certaine learned and elegant Workes of Ffulke Lord Brooke* the peticuler names are as followeth (vizt) *A Treaty of humane Learning. An inquisition vpon fame and honor. A Treaty of Warres. The Tragedy of Alaham. The Tragedy of Mustapha*, (by assignment from Master Butter). *Coelia containyng 109 Sonnettes and a letter 'of Travell' . . . vjd*"; and on October 24, 1632 (Arber, IV. 287), the same stationer had entered Cowley's *Poeticall blossomes* "vnder the handes of Sir Henry Herbert and master Aspley Warden." I cannot find any notice in the Registers of a translation of Ovid's *Heroical Epistles* authorized by Herbert.

² Johannes Prinz, *John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, 1927, p. 161.

³ V. de Sola Pinto, *Rochester, Portrait of a Restoration Poet*, 1935, p. 122.

⁴ So titled on the manuscript in the British Museum. Reprinted by John Hayward in his *Collected Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, 1926, pp. 241-247.

⁵ Allardyce Nicoll, *Restoration Drama*, p. 372, dates Settle's play as of May, 1675.

⁶ Pinto, *Rochester*, p. 259.

return to town, I intend to alter a play of Sir Robert Howard's written long since, and lately put by him into my hands: 'tis called *The Conquest of China by the Tartars*. It will cost me six weeks study, with the probable benefit of an hundred pounds."¹ Evidently the alteration was never made.

The deduction from Dryden's letter and the production date of Settle's play (1673/74 or 1675) that Howard had planned his play in 1672 by no means follows. But, supposing that such were the case and that Howard had had his work anticipated by Settle's homonymous drama, there is no reason why he might not have planned to revise and produce his own play after Settle's had appeared. On the other hand, the circumstances are such that I am inclined to suspect that Howard did not *begin* work on his play until after Settle's production. In a way the two could be looked upon as rivals, Settle's plays having been produced by the Duke's Company, Howard's by "the other house" at the Theatre Royal. Now, as Settle himself frankly admits in his dedication to the printed version of his play,² the production had been a failure. What is more likely, then, than that Howard may have planned a play on the same theme some time after 1674 or 1675, and, following a fairly common practice of the day, sought the collaboration of the witty Earl of Rochester, then at the height of his fame?

In support of this contention there is fairly trustworthy evidence that it was in 1678 that Howard asked for and Rochester gave his collaboration. A letter from Howard to Rochester (July 7, no year) contains the well-known passage which establishes the authorship of the fragment. Howard wrote, "but I forgett how ill I entertaineth upon a good subject; and am sure I shall be better by you though upon an ill one; I mean by the scene you are pleas'd to write; nor shall I repine to see how far you can exceed me."³ Professor Pinto conjecturally assigns this letter to 1672, but Howard's opening words give us definite evidence for assigning it to a later date. They are: "Though this towne is apt enough to like an ill entertainment better than A good one; Yet I Cannot Beleeve them soe stupid as to be in(sen)sible what they should have lost by your death; and I am soe well pleas'd with your health that I am troubled

¹ Scott, *Works of Dryden*, 1821, vol. XVIII, p. 133.

² First Edition, 1676: "But this Poem wants that Perfection to make it so. For, to deviate from the general Style of my Brethren, without imputing its ill success to malice, I acknowledge it Faulty."

³ Printed by Prinz, John Wilmot, p. 286.

I cannot assure you that I owe such an abundance of satisfaction to my friendship only."

Clearly, Howard must have been referring to Rochester's recovery from an illness so severe that the poet had been given up for dead. His letter continues with a bantering reference to a "Doctor" who had drawn up his charge against Nature's "chief minister," and who had evidently kept the earl in retirement for a long time.

But all this could hardly refer to the spring and summer of 1672, when young Lord Rochester, just twenty-five years old, was barely beginning to show the effects of his dissolute life.¹ There is no evidence of any illness, mild or serious, in the spring of that year, and in the summer he seems to have been actively engaged with family affairs, alternating between his wife's estates in Somersetshire and his own home at Adderbury. On May 5 Lady Mary Bertie Lady Rochester's close friend, wrote to her niece from Adderbury.² Her letter contains no reference to illness. On May 29 Howard wrote to Rochester, addressing his letter to Enmore in Somersetshire. Evidently in answer to a request from the earl, Howard, in his capacity as Auditor of the Exchequer, promised formally to serve his lordship in "all the particulars" of his "wages and pension."³ On June 17 Lady Mary Bertie wrote of a great birthday dinner given by Lady Rochester at Adderbury, with sixteen dances following; while on August 3 the same correspondent wrote that "Lord Rochester and his Lady are still in Somersetshire."⁴ Here, surely, is no evidence of a serious and protracted illness.

We must presume, then, that Howard's letter was written in another, and probably later year. Now, as Professor Pinto himself has pointed out,⁵ Rochester was gravely ill in the winter of 1677/78. In the early spring various rumours ran through London. Rochester wrote to Savile in a letter assigned by Hayward to the last of February, 1678 (a date with which Pinto evidently agrees), "This day I receiv'd the unhappy news of my own Death and Burial."⁶ On April 23 Lady Chaworth wrote to Lord Roos that Rochester

¹ Cf. Pinto, *Rochester*, p. 169.

² Rutland MSS., II. 25.

³ Printed by Prinz, *John Wilmot*, p. 285. This letter is not to be confused with that of July 7. It is dated May 29, 1672.

⁴ Rutland MSS., II. 25-26.

⁵ Pinto, *Rochester*, "Chronology," p. 261.

⁶ Hayward, *Collected Works*, p. 254.

had "bin att the gates of death."¹ On June 2 Savile wrote to Rochester, "Though we have had some scurvy alarums since you left us concerning your health, yet the last time I saw my Lord Cornwallis hee assured mee you were upon the improving hand. . . ."² But it was not until midsummer that the poet had recovered sufficiently to make the journey up to London.

I suggest, then, that it was at this time, when Rochester had just recovered from an almost fatal illness, had determined to settle down to a more serious way of living, and had, perhaps, already begun work on his major dramatic effort, the revision of Fletcher's *Valentinian*³—in short, that it was in July 1678 that Howard wrote of his pleasure at the news of his friend's recovery and of his determination to write a "sceen" to be incorporated in the dramatist's new—or revised—play.

J. HAROLD WILSON.

A NOTE ON *HAVELOK THE DANE*, l. 1,917

THE admirable work done by Professor Skeat and Mr. Sisam on the text of *Havelok* has left little room for improvement. That little has been further reduced recently by Professor Dickens's note on ll. 64-6 (*Leeds Studies in English*, vol. iv, p. 75) and by Mr. N. R. Ker's letter in *The Times Literary Supplement* of November 14, 1936, which has a bearing on l. 39. These both, it should be noted, rehabilitate MS. readings: Professor Dickens restores the alliterative phrase *hunger ne here* and Mr. Ker the alliterative phrase *wreieres and wrobberes*, in support of which he adduces a hitherto unknown example (from the *Ormulum*) of the variant *wrezen and wrabben*, which is otherwise recorded only once, in the inverted form *wrobbe and wrye* in *Thomas of Erceldoune*, fyttē I, 38. The moral to be drawn from all this—"back to the MS."—can be fruitfully applied to a passage in *Havelok* that has not been satisfactorily explained. In ll. 1,916-9:

So longe haueden he but and bet
With neues under hernes set,
þat of þo sixti men and on
Ne wente away þer liues non

¹ Rutland MSS., II p. 50.

² Bath MSS., II. 161.

³ Assigned by Hayward (*Collected Works*, p. xiv), to the fall of 1678. Pinto suggests (*Rochester*, p. 121) that the poet was working on his alteration at the end of his life, i.e. in July, 1680.

the word *hernes* has been a great stumbling-block. Our editors take it to mean "brains" (O.N. *hjarni*); and Mr. Sisam (not unnaturally) concludes that l. 1,917 as preserved in the MS. does not make sense. In his note, he quotes Holthausen's emendation of *hernes* to *her nesés* ("their noses"), supporting it by an O.N. phrase from *Laxdæla Saga*: *setti hnefann á nasar henni*. Holthausen in his third edition of the poem emends to *heres*, which he regards as a spelling for "ears," with the inorganic *h* so common in Anglo-Norman scribal practice. Neither of these emendations, however, is convincing. The first, though ingenious, yields us a line that does not scan so well as the MS. version. The second does not account palæographically for the alleged corruption (though Holthausen has here stumbled on what I believe to be the real meaning of the word).

For light on *hernes* and on the general sense of the line, one must turn to Old French and Anglo-Norman texts. There one commonly finds it stated that someone or other hits somebody else (often with the fist) *desuz* (*lez*, *dejuste*) *l'oie*—"under (alongside, near) the ear." The following examples may be adduced:

Le chevaler ad *le poins* fortment enhaucé.

Desuz le oi li ad tel coup done

Ke il abati Boefs plat a son pe.

(*Boeve de Haumtone*, 1,052.)

Amont *dessus l'oie*

Li at donneit un colp de l'espee aguisie.

(*Geste de Liège*, II, 5,635.)¹

Dou poing lez l'oie le fiert.

(Bartsch, *Altfranzösische Romanzen und Pastourellen*, p. 204, l. 48.)

Li uns le fiert *delez l'oie*.

(*Li Fabel dou Vilain Mire*, 190.)²

Tel me donna d'un baston *lez l'oie*.

(*Raoul de Cambrai*, 1894.)

Sabaoth prent le burdon, le traïtor feri

Just le oy, mort li abati.

(*Boeve de Haumtone*, 2,764-5.)

Le burdon leve, si ad l'autre feru,

Dejuste le oye, ke mort l'ad estendu.

(*Ibid.*, 3,466-7.)

¹ Quoted by Scheler in his *Glossaire Philologique* to this text.

² Ed. C. Zipperling, Halle, 1912.

Phrases similar to these are to be found in M.E. Cf. :

And he went vp anon his *fest*
And bufeyt hir *vnder þe lest*.

(*Arthour and Merlin*, 8,438-9.)

With ys *hond* a wolde þe *zyue* . a such on *on þe luste*
pat al þy breyn scholde clyue . al aboute ys fuste.

(*Sir Ferumbras*, 1,900)

By God, he smoot me ones *on the list*
For that I rente out of his book a leef,
That of the strook myn ere wex al deaf.

(*Wife of Bath's Tale*, 634.)

And this later example, in Sir Thomas More's *A Mery Jest of a Serjeant* :

And with his *fist*
Upon the list
He gaue him suche a blowe.

These examples, like those quoted from Old French, ring the changes on the preposition, but they agree with the O.F. instances in using a word which has the abstract sense "hearing" as well as that of "ear" (O.F. *oie*,* *audita*) and in the association, in three of the four cases, with *fest* (*hond*), which corresponds to the O.F. *poing* and to *neues* in *Havelok*. It is the merit of Zupitza to have pointed out¹ (without knowledge of the O.F. phrases) that *lest* in *Arthour and Merlin* 8,439 means "ear"; and he adduced O.S. *hlust* as having, like M.E. *lest*, *list* < O.E. *hlyst*, the sense "ear" as well as that of "hearing."

It seems clear from the joint evidence of M.E. and O.F. texts that *hernes* in *Havelok* means "ears" and that it is an adaptation of O.N. *heyryn*, which is not elsewhere recorded in M.E., and which, like M.E. *list*, O.S. *hlust*, and O.F. *oie*, has not only the usual meaning "hearing" but also the less common one "ear." The use of the plural form (as in *neues*) is natural enough in the context, since the poet is describing the blows given by several men in a general *melée*. The phrase is an equivalent of the M.E. expressions that I have quoted, but with *neues* and *hernes* as synonyms for the normal *fest*, *fist* and *lest*, *list*. With this clue, one can turn back to O.N. and search there for a parallel to the idiom in *Havelok*; and, happily, a good one occurs in the prose *Edda*,² the only difference being that

¹ See his review of Kölbing's *Arthour and Merlin*, in *Archiv*, 87, p. 94.

² I have Dr. C. T. Onions to thank for a hint that enabled me to track down this valuable parallel; and also for stimulating criticism and advice on particular points.

eyra does duty for *hern* and *við* for the *undir* that one might have expected: En þórr reiddi til *hnefann* ok *setr við eyra* Hymi, svá at hann steypðisk fyrir borð, ok sér í iljar honum (*Snorra Edda*, in Jónsson's edition, p. 56, l. 17). This appears to be the only traceable instance of the phrase in O.N., though both Zoega and Heggstad record it without references under *eyra*.¹ That *heyryn* is an equivalent of *eyra* is made quite clear by Snorri: *eyru heita hlustir ok heyryn* (*ibid.*, p. 145, l. 24).

It is worth noting that where the *Havelok* idiom diverges from this Norse example, it corresponds with the O.F.-M.E. type: in the use of *under* and of a sb. with the abstract sense "hearing," as against *eyra*. The omission in *Havelok* of the definite article, which is a fixed element in the M.E. and O.F. phrases, is exactly paralleled in the *Edda* passage. M.E. *e* as a representation of O.N. *ey* from *au* by i-mutation is admittedly unusual (see Luick, § 384, 4; Jordan, § 130, 2; Wright, *Elementary Middle English Grammar*, § 170), but is natural enough in this instance, in view of the two following consonants.² And the fact that *heyryn* is not otherwise recorded in M.E. means nothing, since one is dealing with a text in which the Norse element is unusually large. It may be nothing more than a remarkable chance that *hern* is a variant reading in the Cotton MS. of the *Cursor Mundi*, l. 8,080, for *eren*, *eres*, of the other MSS. But *n*-plurals are so rare (according to Hupe's material: Part VII, p. 178)* that one might reasonably suspect this to be a second example of O.N. *heyryn*.³ It is true that the Cotton MS. has occasional instances of an inorganic initial *h*; and *hern* is regarded as another of these in the *N.E.D.* But I can discover only two between lines 7,080 and 9,080—*heild*, "age," 7,087, and *hill-wil* 7,834. The initial *h* alone would be but slender evidence of identity with the *Havelok* word; but in combination

¹ This phrase is evidently a particular application of the basic *setja hnefann*. Another is Mr. Sisam's *setti hnefann á nasar henni*; and a third appears in *Hav.* 2405-6:

With þe neue he Robert sette
Biforn þe teth a dint ful strong.

² I am glad to have the support of Professor Tolkien on this point. He has ingeniously suggested, as an alternative, that *hern* in *Havelok* may be an anglicization of O.N. *heyryn* (on the basis of M.E. *here*, "to hear"); this neatly resolves the phonological difficulty.

³ *Hern* occurs in rhyme with *wern* (pret. pl.), which, though much less frequent than *wer(e)*, is established by the other occurrences in 11, 490 (rhyming with *stern*, "star") and in 20,449 (rhyming with *bern*, "child").

with the final *-n*, in a text where *n*-plurals are so rare, it is worth much more. That both these phenomena should occur simultaneously in a single word (which is what one implies in assuming *hern* to be written for *eren*, "ears") is not very likely. Add to this the fact that the vocabulary of *Cursor Mundi*, like that of *Havelok*, is particularly rich in Norse words and that the Cotton MS. usually has better readings than the other MSS., especially when rare words are concerned; and it seems that *hern* here is probably genuine, as an adaptation of O.N. *heyrn*.

In any case, we have to add to our dictionaries a rare word (perhaps a *hapax legomenon*) and a rare idiom, both adapted from Norse; and we are once again warned that the readings of M.E. MSS. (even of corrupt ones) must be respected.

G. V. SMITHERS.

THE BURNING OF HEOROT

THE *Beowulf* poet foretells in the following words the fate of Heorot (lines 81b-85):

Sele hlifade
heah ond horngeap; heaðowylma bad,
laðan liges; ne was hit lenge þa gen
þæt se ecghete apumsweoran
æfter wælniðe wæcnan scolde.

Since we learn, in a later episode (lines 2,020 ff.), that Ingeld was married to Hroðgar's daughter and that war broke out anew between Dane and Bard after the marriage, it seems clear that the poet thought Heorot to have been burned in the course of this war. We learn further, from a well-known passage in *Widsith* (lines 45-49), that Ingeld was defeated at Heorot by Hroðgar and Hroþwulf. It was presumably "on this occasion" that "the famous hall Heorot was destroyed by fire" (Klaeber, *Beowulf*, p. xxxv).

In a recent study, Mr. R. Girvan disputes this presumption.¹ He admits that "we should naturally gather from the poem that Heorot was attacked and fired by Ingeld and his Heathobards." Of the two items, however, (1) the attack and (2) the firing, only the first, he thinks, is supported by the *Widsith* passage, from which we learn (1) that a battle between Bard and Dane took place at Heorot

¹ *Beowulf and the Seventh Century* (London, 1935), pp. 66 f.

and (2) that in this battle the Bards suffered defeat. To quote : " it is certain that it [*i.e.* Heorot] was attacked, but unsuccessfully . . . and it is unlikely that the hall succumbed in an unsuccessful attack." In other words, the *Widsith* poet's localization of the battle proves that an attack on Heorot took place, but his report of the issue of the battle indicates that the attackers did not fire the hall. The argument, so far, has little cogency, since it is evident that the Bards may have set fire to the hall even though finally defeated in the battle, while *Beowulf*, 82 ff., points unmistakably to this as the actual course of events. Mr. Girvan therefore turns to the Scandinavian sources for support. He writes,

The Scandinavian *Bjarkamål* makes it clear that the burning was connected with the internecine strife of the Scyldings after Hrothgar's death, and that is the sort of point on which the *Bjarkamål* can hardly be wrong. It will not do to think of a double destruction, the hall being re-erected in the interval; the new hall would not be Heorot. The only admissible conclusion is that the [*Beowulf*] poet was misinformed, and that means that he did not draw his information from sources trustworthy on historical detail. It is barely [*i.e.* hardly] possible that in ll. 82 ff. we have two distinct events, the war with Ingeld and the burning, for the statements are too closely associated, and the order would be curious, but it is very possible that our poet has in error combined two distinct incidents in the life of the hall.

It will be seen that the argument depends on the witness of the *Bjarkamål*. If, however, we examine this poem, we find that Heorot is nowhere mentioned in it. We learn of a hall-burning, it is true, but the hall so destroyed is not Hroðgar's hall, Heorot, but Hroþwulf's hall, the name of which has not come down to us. Moreover, the Scandinavian sources make it clear that *two* Scylding halls were destroyed by burning. No less than three hall-burnings are recorded, indeed, but two of these go back to the same historical event, I think; see my discussion of 1929,¹ a discussion which Mr. Girvan seems to have overlooked. We may conclude that the substantial accuracy of the *Beowulf* poet in this matter is confirmed rather than shaken by the evidence to be found in the Scandinavian sources.

KEMP MALONE.

¹ *Studies in English Philology* (Klaeber Miscellany), p. 143; the burnings in question are told in the *Bjarkarmur*.

REVIEWS

Zur Vorgeschichte des "Beowulf." By W. A. BEHRENDSON. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard. 1935. Pp. 302. 15 Kroner.

Beowulf and the Seventh Century: Language and Content. By RITCHIE GIRVAN. (Methuen's Old English Library, Studies 1.) London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. 1935. Pp. viii+86. 3s. 6d. net.

HERE are two books on the origin of *Beowulf*—books at least which both seek to explain the form and content of the poem as we now have it; yet their methods, style, and results differ *toto calo*. Dr. Behrendsohn, who is introduced by a very tentative preface from the pen of Otto Jespersen, gives us a full-length and boldly speculative analysis of *Beowulf* into its "older and younger" strata—from the first funeral song of praise over the hero's body to the completed literary epic. He can assign every line to its type and period—whether original heroic lay, or popular tale, or Christian accretion. In an appendix he can even re-arrange *Widsiþ* in its proper sequence so as to make the poem conform to his view of its origin. Truly, as Otto Jespersen says (p. 9), *Beowulf* "is in many ways a tantalizing poem, in so far as it is easy to see that it contains heterogeneous elements, heathen and Christian; but it is no easy matter to separate these strata." But little beyond this conclusion will be left in the mind of the few and probably weary readers who are in at the establishing of Dr. Behrendsohn's almost blatantly over-confident results. Some 506 lines of *Beowulf* are shown, to the author's entire satisfaction, by proofs which he regards as objective (though these consist largely of purely stylistic criteria) to belong to the original heroic lay part of the poem; and bit by bit the whole is analysed and assigned to its stratum. No notice is taken of linguistic evidence and allied matters, but considerable learning in Scandinavian literature enables great play to be made with parallels. A few bibliographical notes conclude the book.

Dr. Behrendsohn has always been a student of *Beowulf* from the folkloristic point of view associated with the name of Panzer many years ago, and now perhaps to be seen still productive in the work of Professor and Mrs. Chadwick. So much learning and such diligence could not but produce, here and there, results of real value and interest; but, as a whole, Dr. Behrendsohn's book leaves the reader with an impression of over-confident and learned speculation of a rather esoteric kind upon matters which are incapable of proof or even reliable inference and by methods which are now considered by most to have ceased to be fruitful.

Mr. Girvan has achieved already a high reputation as an Anglo-Saxon grammarian; and this little volume of three lectures delivered in London last year is the restrained, closely-reasoned, and unassumingly scholarly work naturally to be looked for from the author of the *Angelsaksisch Handboek*. Under the headings of "Language," "Background," and "Folklore and History," he traverses in his few closely-packed pages much of the ground covered in extensive discourse by Dr. Behrendsohn, with the addition of a fresh and well-argued view of some of those matters of linguistic character which Dr. Behrendsohn has left unconsidered. Yet he too has some conclusions, though these are indicated with caution.

In the first lecture Mr. Girvan shows how the separation between the language of O.E. poetry and that of its prose has been over-emphasized and exaggerated, and how the state of the language of our unique MS. points to the poem having been composed as a *literary* whole and at once written down in about the age of Bede in a form substantially as we have it now—thus concluding almost the very opposite of Dr. Behrendsohn's results. Against the gradual building up, beginning with Danish lays, of the sixth or seventh centuries assumed by Dr. Behrendsohn, Mr. Girvan by his linguistic arguments almost obliterates the likelihood of any *Vorgeschichte* at all for *Beowulf*. But this first lecture on the language, more than its successors, suffers from compression; so that often the evidence on which Mr. Girvan relies is not produced or even clearly indicated.

In the next lecture Mr. Girvan shows that generally the poet of *Beowulf* is describing the conditions of life which he himself knew, and that where he is dealing with traditions of older times he often makes mistakes. Once more his view of the essential unity of the poem as the presentation of its narrative in a mainly contemporary background leaves little room for the *Vorgeschichte* constructed by

Dr. Behrendsohn, though they are nearly on common ground in emphasizing the stylistic differences resulting from the fundamentally "emotional presentation of life" seen in *Beowulf* and the older and more objective attitude implied in the *Finnsburg Fragment*. In his suggestion of the Celtic element in Anglo-Saxon poetic thought and its possible origin in closer racial mixture in Northern England than is usually admitted by historians, Mr. Girvan touches the fringe of a very fascinating subject.

In his last lecture Mr. Girvan definitely supports some sort of historical origin for the hero of the poem and effectively compares him with figures of mediæval romance like Richard I of England or Charlemagne, who are at once historical yet the centre of a multitude of fictions. He shows that the picture of Hrothgar (p. 69) "can only come from a developed heroic poetry," and that "our poet has inherited the traditional picture. It is not a direct transcript from reality, but transformed by successive handling, a re-interpretation of facts in the interest of emotional values." The poet, he indicates, makes mistakes in dealing with Danish history (as, for instance, in confusing the two episodes in the history of Heorot in lines 81-86 of *Beowulf*); yet he is fairly exact in his knowledge of the history of the Geats.

It is to be regretted that Mr. Girvan's book had to take the form of these very compressed and concentrated lectures; and it is to be hoped that he will later write a larger volume in which the evidence he so suggestively touches upon here may be fully set out and his arguments presented in a more easily readable shape. The volume is a noteworthy addition to the series of Methuen's *Old English Library*; and, like all its predecessors, it suffers from extreme compression.

In view of the relative importance of this little volume, a few remarks are here added on points of detail. On p. 15 one would like some information on the "abnormal metrical types" which were "regarded as admissible licence and imitated later." The famous entry in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* on the slaying of King Cynewulf described as originally a lay (p. 31) is probably to be accounted for stylistically from a *prose* oral tradition of the saga-type. It is going perhaps too far to say that the preservation of *Beowulf* (p. 31) was "a sort of accident" and that it was one poem of its type among many; and its importance in Old English literary tradition seems to have been underestimated. On p. 48 the reference to "the *fagan*

flor " is to line 725 of the poem, where we read *on fagne flor* ; and here a glance at the village of Fawler (O.E. *fag flor*) would have been useful to the student.

C. L. WRENN.

The Owl and the Nightingale. Edited by J. H. G. GRATTAN and G. F. H. SYKES. Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1935 (for 1915). Pp. xxiv+94. 15s. net.

THE poem of which W. P. Ker spoke as " the most miraculous piece of writing . . . among the mediæval English books " is here made available in yet another edition, the purpose of which is different from that of its predecessors. A diplomatic text of a Middle English poem is unusual ; and it requires of an editor exacting work and great precision. Professor Grattan, to whom the edition was entrusted after the death of G. F. H. Sykes, has thought it worth while to carry out this unselfish task and has done it well. In addition, he has provided a glossary, a compact introduction in which the main literary problems are set out and discussed, and notes on the text ; and he has made several original suggestions on textual points.

It is clear that the MSS. have been collated with scrupulous care and accuracy. Scholars may count on this edition for reliable reproduction of the MSS. and for all the palæographical minutiae needed for textual criticism. The palæographical information, along with incidental remarks on textual points, is conveniently set down in footnotes. Among Professor Grattan's additions to and improvements on the readings of Wells and Atkins is an important point : he lays one hoary ghost for ever by pointing out that in l. 1,206 the Cotton MS. undoubtedly reads *smipes*, not *snuwes* (though it should be noticed that the MS. was correctly read by Gadow, whose edition deserves to be better known). Other new readings are to be found in C 99, 385, 408, 905, 1,351. There are only one or two details to be added to Professor Grattan's remarks : in the Jesus MS., l. 4, the words *An* and *and one* are underlined, as well as *vle* and *nyhtegale* ; fol. 233a of the Jesus MS. begins at 545, not 546 ; and in the Cotton MS. (note on 159) the cross in the margin is opposite 160, and the word *god* is opposite 161. But these are trifles. There are one or two textual points on which it is possible to differ with

the editor. In 1,056 one need not assume an original reading "grine þe (=or)" to account for C's *grineþ*. The þ is very like the "hanging" s found in 466 and elsewhere, and is perhaps miswritten for an s of this kind; the line would not scan as well if it contained þe. On the difficult crux of 406, the editor suggests that J's *swykst* and C's *iswicst* descend from an original *þu ne wicst* (O.E. *wican*, to give way); but his explanation in the notes requires us to assume a rather improbable palæographical error. To the crux of 748 Professor Grattan brings another new suggestion: that the original reading was *abide an oper res*, "experience another attack," and that *es* for *pres* was an error made in the common original of J and C. There are, however, certain objections to this. Palæographical confusion of þ and r, though not impossible, is not one of the more common types of error; and when it comes to deciding whether J's *abyde* or C's *ihere* is spurious, one suspects that *abyde* may have been repeated from the preceding line, especially as *ihere* is supported by the parallel in 544 (uttered by the nightingale as exactly the same sort of vaunting challenge intended here): *þu schalt ihere on oper tale*. Attention should be drawn to Mr. Wrenn's suggestion (see *Medium Ævum* for September 1932, p. 151) that the poet wrote *þes*, "storm."

Professor Grattan's commentary deals with outstanding cruces and difficulties of interpretation, and includes many new ideas. One might remark that in 838 *al* is probably not the sb. "everything" but the adverb "entirely." On *heme* in 1,115 reference should be made to Professor Tolkien's article in the *Review of English Studies*, I. 215, and to Miss d'Ardenne's edition of *Seinte Juliene* (which was not accessible when Professor Grattan completed his work), p. 157. Professor Grattan has made a valuable suggestion in connection with 1,751, where J's *yet*, as he says, is probably a relic of the dual form of the pronoun of the 2nd person. His defence of *mizte* turns on a supposed idiomatic ellipsis, for which he presumably has other evidence, but which does not, in the absence of a parallel, convince the reader.

In his footnotes Professor Grattan suggests that in J 1,523 the original reading was perhaps *þat þe*; and he translates "and in consequence of the man's sinning," and regards *gulte* as a present subjunctive or a pret. indicative. It is unnecessary, however, to assume that *þat* has been omitted in the extant texts; and since *gulte* occurs in a series of present indicatives, it is probably a present

indicative itself, the *-þ* having been suppressed by a scribe. This type of rhyme, in which final *-e* rhymes with *-eþ*, *-er*, *-el*, etc., is well evidenced in Middle English, though it is usually obscured by the alterations of scribes who attempted to make the rhyme correct according to their own notions. For a possible instance, cf. *Orfeo*, 341-2; there are numerous examples in the *Kyng Alisaunder* group. J's *þat* for *þe* in C may be merely a more emphatic word and not necessarily a survival of what the poet wrote; and the line as it stands is syntactically and idiomatically better than if we read *þat þe were*, and combines more naturally with the lines that follow. Professor Grattan accepts and improves on Kenyon's emendation of *bihaiteſt* in 1,322 to *behaldeſt*; he adopts it in the form *bihalſt*, which is palæographically better. He ingeniously suggests that in *smiþes* of 1,206 the *-es* represents the unstressed pronoun "them"; it is possible, however, that an original sg. *smiþ*, parallel with the sg. *sea* in 1,205, has been altered under the influence of the plural *ſchipes*.

The editor's introduction sums up the various views on the literary problems. He thinks "the old, complacent guess" that the poem was written near Portisham is improbable, and that the author is likely to have been one John of Guildford, who was perhaps an elderly ecclesiastic, rather than a Nicholas of Guildford.

The glossary is a careful and detailed piece of work. One would have liked to find mention of rare or special senses such as that of *node* in the rare phrase *don gode node*, 388, where it means "service"; cf. *Kyng Alisaunder*, 2,343: Orest he brouȝt on ſtede And bad hym done gode nede, and the O.F. *feire bonne besongne* (see Morawski's *Proverbes Français*, no. 376). The synonymous *don gode note* of 1,624 should be added, and also *gon on honde* "to capitulate" in 1,651. *Ibedde* in C 968 is not the sb. "bedfellow," but probably represents *i bedde* "in bed"; *lauedi bedde* in J sounds spurious, and might well be a corruption of *loue i bedde* (by substitution of a synonym of *loue* and consequent haplography of *i*).

There appears to be a double misprint in 1,705, where both MSS. read *so*, not *o*.

This book is clearly the work of an experienced and conscientious scholar. Professor Grattan's views on linguistic problems will not all meet with agreement; but they are stimulating and perform the useful service of making us go over the ground again more thoroughly. His work on the MSS. has provided us with valuable apparatus for close study of the text.

G. V. SMITHERS.

Sir Degare. A Study of the Texts and Narrative Structure.

By G. PATTERSON FAUST. Princeton : Princeton University Press ; London : H. Milford. 1935. Pp. 99. 7s. net.

THIS volume is the eleventh in the series *Princeton Studies in English*, edited by G. H. Gerould. It consists of two parts, one in which the writer attempts a recension of the numerous MSS. and printed texts, and another in which he discusses *Sir Degare* as a specimen of mediæval narrative.

A study of the MS. relationships had already been made by Schleich in his edition of 1929, and by Miss M. B. Carr in an unpublished dissertation. Mr. Faust's object is "to make explicit what is implicit in their work, the *kind* of relation among the texts"; and he restricts the evidence to omissions and additions. Scholars who are interested in the question of borrowings in Middle English romances and Breton lays from other poems of the same kind will notice his detailed comparison of two passages from *Sir Degare* with two others, from *Lai le Freine* and *Beves of Hamptoun* respectively, to which they are closely alike, and on which he thinks they have been modelled. His results differ from those of his predecessors in respect of the Percy Folio text, which he considers to be in the main line of development from the original, while the other extant texts "are spurs which have undergone modification independent of that to which the main line was subject." He also thinks that the Percy text has been contaminated with the Douce MS. and the King and Copland prints, though, as he admits, the evidence is slight.

The second part of Mr. Faust's work, in which he analyses the narrative structure of *Sir Degare*, is the more interesting and valuable. He finds that three distinct elements are combined in *Sir Degare*—the *Sohrab and Rustum* type of story, with the combat between a father and a son who do not know each other's identity; the motif of the father who sets his daughter's suitors to accomplish impossible tasks; and the legend of Gregory, from which, in Mr. Faust's opinion, there has been direct borrowing. This analysis seems reasonable; at any rate, one would not deny the presence in *Sir Degare* of ingredients similar to these three types of story, though one might not accept Mr. Faust's view of their relation to analogues and of the genesis of the *Sir Degare* narrative. The verbal parallels (pp. 49 ff.) between *Sir Degare* and the Gregory legend, especially

in the O.F. version, are certainly striking; but these parallels take in only a part of the narrative—the exposure incident, which is a commonplace, as Mr. Faust himself concedes. One other point that the writer believes to be very important is the education of Degare in *clerkes lore*. He thinks this a feature so unusual in the education of a hero of romance as to indicate borrowing from the legend of Gregory (p. 49). Whether it is unusual or not, his assumption is rather bold, and, for what it is worth, an instance of a similar education for a hero of romance may be quoted here. Alexander the Great, according to the author of *Kyng Alisaunder*, had seven teachers, and we are told that *þe seuene maister techen his þars, And þe wytt of þe seuene ars* (665–76); cf. the fact that the hero of *The Seven Sages of Rome* (ed. Brunner) was also educated by seven sages, in similar studies (167–206). Mr. Faust makes too much of Degare's education. He goes on to argue that this learning is a suspicious element in the narrative because it is not necessary to the plot. One need not, however, boggle at the idea of a cultured hero of romance, even if his culture does not affect the plot.

The evidence for the “vestigial trace of incest” that Mr. Faust suspects is tenuous. This element in the plot seems to him an important link between *Sir Degare* and the legend of Gregory; he thinks that the author of the lay took it over from his original without fully adapting it to his own narrative. Mr. Faust rejects Slover's suggestion that *Sir Degare* should be classed with the “Perseus” type of story, in which the hero is the grandson of the jealous father and meets him in combat; and he explains the fact that the hero fights his grandfather, rather than his father, as “an inevitable modification of the Cnomaus theme” (due, one presumes, to the necessity of fusing the Cnomaus with the *Sohrab and Rustum* type of story).

After examining particular elements in the narrative and comparing them with certain analogues, Mr. Faust concludes that *Sir Degare* and the O.F. *Richars li Biaus* derive from a common source, S, which was already influenced by the legend of Gregory; and that the Dutch *Die Riddere metter Mouwen*, which is similar, is also dependent on the legend of Gregory and derives, along with S, from another romance, T, which was very like S in structure. In building up his argument, Mr. Faust has again made too much of Degare's education. His deductions may be correct; but the evidence is not conclusive.

Mr. Faust is at his best in discussing the supernatural elements in *Sir Degare* and the possibility that the poem is of Celtic origin, and especially in his interpretation of the magic gloves that are used as a recognition token. He considers that the supernaturalism in the story is of secondary origin and that the gloves are a clumsy addition; the inconsistencies in the author's use of the gloves are not due to "a partial rationalization of an original feature of the story" but to "an unintelligent use of borrowed material." All this is reasonable; but surely it is dangerous to set about explaining or eliminating every hint of unreason from a mediæval tale. Apropos of the gloves, the fifteenth-century Catalan version of *La Fille sans Mains* might have been mentioned.

Sir Degare has certain supernatural elements not shared by *Richars li Biaus* (to which it is related); these are therefore ascribed by Mr. Faust not to Celtic origin but to the author of *Sir Degare*, whom he suspects of having added to a generally current story the conventional setting and adjuncts of the Breton lay. He may be right in saying that the poem is a Breton lay only in a conventional sense; but he would have done well to pay more attention to the Breton lays as a class when filling in the background of *Sir Degare*. For instance, he quotes one parallel to the fairy lover—from *Tydorel*; but a supernatural lover, or a lover who makes use of magic, appears also in Marie's *Yonec*¹ and in the English *Sir Gowther*, and a fairy mistress in *Lanval* and *Graelent* (cf. the supernatural parentage of Merlin in *Arthour and Merlin*, 843 ff.). And it is of some interest that the most convincing explanation of the name *Degare* (according to which it represents the O.F. past participle *esgaré*, amalgamated with the particle *d'*) supplies a link with *Emaré*, in which the heroine at one stage of her misfortunes assumes the name *Egaré* (360). Finally, that very quality on which Mr. Faust rightly insists (p. 87) as distinguishing *Sir Degare* from *Richars li Biaus*—the relative conciseness and economy in the narrative of the first, as against the diffuseness of the latter—also distinguishes the Breton lay as a genre from the romance.

In this book Mr. Faust seems to have been re-working or exploring more fully material that was already known, rather than adding much that is new. His handling of the problems is thoughtful and his opinions are reasonable. One merely wonders whether he

¹ It is worth noting that Schofield (*English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*, p. 186) saw fit to include *Milun* and *Doon* in this category.

is not inclined to explain and derive and account for overmuch in the narrative elements of the poem. Such a tendency is perhaps inherent in the analytical and comparative method which is indispensable in the study of mediæval literature; but it may make one dangerously blind to an author's individuality—to a human element that is capable of the capricious or irrational and whose operations are not always amenable to analysis.

G. V. SMITHERS.

Lydgate's Troy Book. Edited from the best manuscripts with introduction, notes, and glossary by HENRY BERGEN, Ph.B., Ph.D. Part IV. (Early English Text Society. Extra Series 126.) London: Humphrey Milford. 1935. Pp. viii + 572. 15s. net.

WITH the appearance of Part IV of Lydgate's *Troy Book*, Mr. Henry Bergen has completed a task the foundations of which were first made public in 1906.¹ Before turning to the book itself, it is fitting that congratulations should be extended to the Early English Text Society and to Mr. Bergen for bringing to a happy close the editing of two of that triad of poems for which Lydgate's name is best known. For exactly thirty years the members of the Society have found that Mr. Bergen's publications are a model of what Middle English research should be (and often is not), and the present volume amply proves to be all that Mr. Bergen's readers have been led to expect.

The book consists of five sections: Bibliographical Introduction, Notes on Guido delle Colonne, Notes on Lydgate's Text, Glossary, and Index to Lydgate's Text. Turning first of all to the Glossary, it will be found to be not only the most extensive portion but that likely to prove of greatest interest to Middle English students. As I have counted them, there are some 100 *important* corrections and additions to the *New English Dictionary*, including in this total words to which the *N.E.D.* assigns the date 1412-20 on the strength of their appearance in the 1555 print, but which Mr. Bergen states

¹ It speaks highly for the accurate proof-reading in this volume that but two misprints came to the reviewer's notice. Amusingly enough, the editor refers (in the Preface) to the Bibliographical Introduction as being "first printed in 1903"; this presumably refers to the editor's Munich dissertation printed in Bungay, 1906. The other misprint will be found on p. 372, where the first usage for joint is given as: NED 1515, Hoccleve (instead of 1415).

are not found in the MSS. and must therefore belong to a later date. In addition to this, Mr. Bergen records over 1,500 examples of earlier usage than the first date noted in the dictionary; more than 1,000 cases for which the *N.E.D.* gives no adequate quotation or, alternatively, no example whatsoever for the particular sense, use, form, construction, phrase, etc., in which the word appears in the *Troy Book*; and finally, if I have counted aright, some 13 new "last usages." In addition to this impressive list of achievements, we may also note the fact that many words have either received completely new descriptions or have been more sharply defined than in the *N.E.D.* The Glossary alone, then, is one of the most important contributions to Middle English scholarship that the E.E.T.S. has issued, and the editors of the forthcoming Middle English dictionary will have much for which to thank Mr. Bergen.¹

Of an estimated total of 7,200 lines in the Geneva edition of Guido de Columna's *Historia destructionis Troiae*, some 4,464 counted lines have not been printed by Mr. Bergen in his notes; in short, it may be noted that under the modest title "Notes on Guido delle Colonne" Mr. Bergen has, for the first time, edited over a third of Guido with an adequate number of *variae lectionis*. Until the appearance of Professor Griffin's promised critical edition, Mr. Bergen's text will not only be of use to those seeking the source of Lydgate's poem but also to the mediævalist interested in the grouping and identification of the various MSS. and prints. It may be worth while to add here a few notes on the only fifteenth-century edition to which Mr. Bergen had no access. This edition is attributed by the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* (No. 7227) to the press of Jean Croquet at Geneva, c. 1480.² Following Mr. Bergen's readings (pp. 105 and 127), it will be found that the Geneva edition was not copied from the Strassburg prints (which, in any case, are believed to be of a slightly later date), for the additions peculiar to these four do not occur here. The print also does not follow the ter Hoernen edition in describing Beelzebub as the "deus

¹ There will, of course, be cases where some will disagree with Mr. Bergen. If two examples may be singled out, "festeye" has the note "no ex. of word *N.E.D.*," but there seems to be an adequate example of it in the *N.E.D.* under "festy"; for "felaship" Mr. Bergen adds the note "*N.E.D.*, armed followers, 1466, but the meaning here is the crew of a ship" which is the exact definition given by the *N.E.D.* for "fellowship," 6c. Such very minor points do not in the least impair the value of Mr. Bergen's really magnificent contribution.

² This book was attributed to Lyon: Ortuin and Schenck, c. 1482, in the *J.P. Morgan Catalogue . . . of Early Printed Books* (III. 44-45 with Mr. Proctor's interesting note).

muscarum" (p. 139), and it includes king "Euiphilus" (*sic*), omitted in the Cologne volume (p. 136). Croquet's print differs from all the editions seen by Mr. Bergen (*cf.* p. 149) in that it is divided into 35 "books" (subdivided, in turn, into 41 sections) plus a prologue, the epitaphs of Hector and Achilles, and the "conclusio actoris." In parts the text is very corrupt; for example, page 195, ll. 17-21, reads in the Geneva edition (sig. o5 verso):

Deinde a predicto portu discessi et fere per tres dies
proximo sequentes feliciter nauigauit.

The compositor omitted four whole lines, doubtlessly owing to the homœoteleuton error; Lydgate, on the other hand, has the complete text (v, 1,859-71). Similarly the Geneva edition omits (sig. n2 verso) the sentence "Sunt enim auaricie templum et cupiditatis auxilium" (Bergen, p. 182, ll. 37/8) which Lydgate renders as:

For, in sothnes, þei ben in her entent
Of couetise verray receptacle,
And to possede eke þe tabernacle.
Her hert is ay so gredy to embrace,
þat auarice haþ his loggyng place
Mid of her breste, þis vice of vices alle! (IV, 5,884-9.)

Again (page 112, ll. 23/4), "quod iason se desiderabiliter impleturum humili et submissa voce respondit" is omitted and the following four lines are considerably shortened. The next sentence "Sicque ad medee suasum iason in colcos per vnus mensis spacium moram traxit" is again omitted in the Geneva print, though it may be found in Lydgate's translation (I, 3,589-93) as:

And whan Iason after his Iourne,
Ful richely, liche to his degre,
Refresched was in Colchos of þe kyng
With al þat my3t[e] ben to his likyng,
And a moneth passed was and goon, etc.

The Geneva edition was obviously printed from a manuscript differing considerably from the one used by Lydgate as well as from those used for the other fifteenth-century editions.

The Bibliographical Introduction both extends and shortens the editor's previously published *Description and Genealogy of the Manuscripts and Prints of Lydgate's Troy Book* (Bungay, 1906). It is extended by the inclusion of descriptions of seven manuscripts unknown to the editor in 1906, two of which appear to be both early and good. The omissions are largely confined to the lists of variant readings by means of which the relationship of the MSS.

to one another was determined; as they may be readily consulted in the dissertation, there was clearly no advantage in reprinting the extensive lists and Mr. Bergen wisely refrained from doing so. The descriptions of the MSS. and prints were done with the editor's usual painstaking care and leave nothing to be desired. Some readers would doubtless have preferred longer lists of orthographical and dialectal peculiarities, but I incline to the view expressed by Professor Schick in his Preface to the *Temple of Glass* (E.E.T.S., E.S. 60, p. vii) that the study of Lydgate's language and metre should be treated in a special work; the dialectal peculiarities of the various MSS. have no connection whatsoever with Lydgate's work and are only of interest to the philologist. The remaining two sections are perhaps of lesser importance than those already discussed, though the very full Index will be welcome indeed to anyone wanting to find quickly what Lydgate may have had to say (generally much too much) on any one of 768 different headings, without the necessity of having to glance through the 30,000 lines of text. The Notes to Lydgate's text could have been increased indefinitely without adding any particular value to the book; those Mr. Bergen included are most useful in explaining the more obscure parts of the text, grammar, metre, etc.¹

Taken as a whole, Part IV of the *Troy Book* is probably the most important contribution to Middle English scholarship since the appearance of the same editor's *Fall of Princes* (1923-27). We may hope that Mr. Bergen will not fail, after his thirty-five years' devotion to Lydgate studies, to amplify at some future time his spirited defence of Lydgate's work which he first presented in the introductory notes to the *Troy Book* and to the *Fall of Princes*. Lydgate's work has been much berated and Mr. Bergen, as the greatest Lydgate scholar of the day, may well have some final judgment to make on the work of the Monk of Bury. Lydgate could, on occasion, rise to very great heights; certainly the "Envoy on Rome" in the *Fall of*

¹ With the book is issued a leaflet entitled *Additions and Corrections to the Fall of Princes*, largely corrections to the variant readings of the *Daunce of Machabree*. Mr. Bergen also adds to the twelve already-listed copies of Pynson's 1494 edition of the *Fall of Princes* the Lothian one, now in the Harvard College Library. Still another copy is in the library of Mrs. Edward L. Doheny of Los Angeles, California. Through the courtesy of Mrs. Doheny's librarian, Miss Lucille Miller, I have been informed that this copy lacks the first signature as well as the first and last leaves of the last signature; also b1 and h1 are supplied from another copy. The volume appeared in the Way Sale of July 1, 1881. The Lothian (Newbattle Abbey) copy of Lawrence's *De la ruine des nobles hommes et femmes* (Bruges, Mansion, 1476) is now in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass.

Princes is one of the noblest pieces written in the fifteenth century. A just criticism of Lydgate's ability, his contribution to Middle English literature, and his importance to the writers following him is much needed, and Mr. Bergen is the one man to do it.

CURT F. BÜHLER.

The Allegory of Love : A Study in Medieval Tradition.

By C. S. LEWIS. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1936.
Pp. x+378. 15s. net.

It is rarely that we meet with a work of literary criticism of such manifest and general importance as this. No one could read it without seeing all literature a little differently for ever after. Mr. Lewis has traced the progress of two fundamental movements of the human mind—romantic love and allegory—up to their first convergence in mediæval French and English literature, and on to the *Faerie Queene*, thereby defining an age of literature which has been awaiting its cartographer—the age that opens with Chrétien de Troyes and ends with Spenser. As a literary form, the allegory of love ends with Spenser ; but as Mr. Lewis reminds us constantly, and most strongly in his conclusion, Spenser himself is “ among the founders of that romantic conception of marriage which is the basis of all our love literature from Shakespeare to Meredith.” And modern analogues to mediæval convention are constantly being suggested, or suggesting themselves, as we read this book. (To take a small and perhaps trivial example, do not the symptoms predicted for the lover in the *Romaunt of the Rose* reappear in David Copperfield's wooing of Dora—even to the tight boots ?)

In the first two chapters the author surveys the nature and evolution of his two principles. Much of the ground of the first chapter, on Courtly Love, has been traversed before ; but the detailed fineness of the distinctions drawn is new, and precludes any easy explanation of this revolutionary change in human sentiment. Especially illuminating is the account of Andreas Capellanus' third book, which brings the close of *Troilus and Criseyde* into true focus. The second chapter is a diagnosis of allegory ; its main thesis is that the need for allegory had a twofold cause—“ the gods sink into personifications [and] a widespread moral revolution forces men to personify their passions.” This argument, pursued with a lucidity and sureness that are beyond praise, leads us from Statius' *Thebais* through Prudentius,

Claudian, Martianus Capella, to the school of Chartres ; much of it is critical exposition, helped by fluent original translations. Indeed, Mr. Lewis' favourite method is the simple-subtle practice of many lecturers—that of “telling the story” with comments. This is perhaps especially rewarding in his account of the *Roman de la Rose*, where for the first time the depth and delicacy of the allegory are clearly demonstrated, with little recourse to that translation of terms so insulting to good allegory, which is not a riddle to be solved but (as Mr. Coghill said of *Piers Plowman*) “the eye through which the poem is seen.”

The sense of a steadily moving, self-enriching argument is less fully maintained after this third chapter, and the choice of material becomes perhaps more personal. But a strict interpretation of the subject would have left out Chaucer (who does not use allegory save for decoration and brief inset episode) ; and that would have been absurd. And the dramatising of de Lorris' love-allegory in *Troilus and Criseyde* (so close in Book II that we can almost see Bialacoil, Franchise, Pite, and Danger moving across that “pavéd parlour” and upper room) is sufficient defence. But why not include also the *Knight's Tale* and *Franklin's Tale* ? Or why virtually exclude *Piers Plowman* while including the *Pèlerinage de la Vie Humaine* ? But this is only to wish the middle chapters twice as long.

The chapter on Chaucer is excellent on its larger topics—the debt to de Lorris, the serious beauty of the *Parlement of Foules*, and the meaning of *Troilus and Criseyde*. It is to be regretted that Mr. Lewis allows himself a sneer at “women [who] take up English literature” ; but although he thinks Criseyde's character will find less mercy at their hands, it is possible to be less severe than he himself is on Criseyde's infidelity. Did not Chaucer modify his story so as to point a new irony : that the same qualities, fear of loneliness and credulity of lies, which make Criseyde yield to Pandarus and so to Troilus also make her yield to Diomedes ? Some of Mr. Lewis' comments on Chaucer's style seem unduly impatient. The opening lines of Mars' complaint are not “sheer nonentity yawning in thirty syllables” but as delicate a winding into the subject, from *sententia* to personal statement, as begins the *Parlement* ; and the “verbiage” of *Parlement* 527–530 may be a pretty hit at legalistic style.

We return to strict allegory with the age that extends from Gower and Usk to Hawes, Douglas, and Rolland—the last a discovery who will be new to many readers. Here the plan is, wisely, not chrono-

logical; for allegory was then being not so much developed as experimented with—or instinctively assumed as the natural mode for all kinds of subject. Gower is admirably treated, and the "Scottish Chaucerians" are freed from that blighting label, which unfairly suggests an inferior imitation. The *Kingis Quair* certainly deserves its praise, but is not its image for falling in love—"anon astert The blude of all my body to my hert"—possibly a remembrance of Chaucer's "therwith his herte gan to sprede and rise" in *Troilus* I, 278? And the "poetry of marriage" had surely already "emerged from the traditional poetry of adultery" in Chaucer's *Franklin's Tale*.

We reach *The Faerie Queene* not directly from Hawes but through the Italian epic; and this allows Mr. Lewis a buoyant and brilliant excursus on Ariosto. In writing on Spenser himself, he has gaily and (one hopes) finally punctured a number of critical fallacies; for "the history of Spenserian criticism, with one or perhaps two honourable exceptions, is a history of gross under-estimation." Most welcome of all, the true significance of Spenser's "pictures of virtuous and vicious love" is at last made plain—the Bower of Bliss takes its true place, and Spenser emerges less as a stern than as a subtle moralist.

The author dislikes psycho-analysis, but at least it acknowledges no such word as "mazochism," which twice appears here. There are two appendices, elucidating the meanings of Spenser's "Genius" and de Lorris' "Danger"; and the index is excellent. (Anyone improbably hesitating whether to read the book might glance at the entry under "Courtly Love".) I note one omission; Mickey Mouse, mentioned on p. 308, does not appear, though the less topical Pip, Squeak, and Wilfred (p. 300) are included. That they are in the book at all is a fact of some significance. For Mr. Lewis is a critic alive at all points and wearing his learning like a plumed hat. His book, in addition to its other virtues, celebrates the marriage of *Philologia* and Mercury, too long divided.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

Spenser's Faerie Queene. An Interpretation. By JANET SPENS. London: Edward Arnold & Co. 1934. Pp. 144. 8s. 6d. net.

"THE aim I have set before me in this book is to give back to English readers the understanding of and delight in this great poet

which thrilled his contemporaries and early successors." So does Dr. Spens, perhaps accrediting too much the strictures of Dean Church, announce the rather high purpose of six chapters on Spenser as poet, not as man. The last four chapters—"Symbolism," "'From breath of outward circumstance,'" "The Love Theme," "'The Soul an impulse to herself'"—do much toward keeping this exalted promise, for, with a wealth of allusion to and analogy with other English poetry, Dr. Spens reveals bountifully some of that "lost Atlantis" in *The Faerie Queene* that lies "drowned beneath the o'erwhelming years." She unifies her remarks by her contention that "Spenser's poems like Milton's are all parts of a whole," and that "he appears to have intended to incorporate in or to relate to *The Faerie Queene* all that he valued in his other work." Indeed, it is to be regretted that Dr. Spens does not write as critic and interpreter throughout her study, without jeopardizing much sound criticism by two initial chapters of conjecture and speculation that are, in the main, both unnecessary for her subsequent conclusions and untenable from the point of view of sound scholarship.

Dr. Spens states that "*The Faerie Queene* was intended by its author to be a philosophical poem and was so regarded by his contemporaries and immediate successors . . .," but she weakens her position at the very outset by attempting to prove her belief that the "whole plan" of *The Faerie Queene*, "and in part the philosophical basis, was altered, after nearly half of what we now possess was already written, and altered for more or less external reasons to a scheme alien to the poet's thought and genius." It is this argument that we taste in the first chapter ("The Structure"), argument that we cannot digest, argument that is based partly upon discrepancies between the poem and its relation to the Spenser-Harvey correspondence, to *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*, and to the letter to Raleigh, but chiefly upon discrepancies that Dr. Spens observes within the poem itself. These internal discrepancies she finds principally in the first three books, both in inconsistent incident and inconsistent thought and in the constant repetition of motifs. Hardly a flaw in the narrative structure of *The Faerie Queene* is overlooked except perhaps the loss of Una's little lamb, but why such lapses should necessarily point to an earlier and basically different version of the poem and to a hasty revision of that version, Dr. Spens fails to make clear. Even the identification of Faeryland with Elizabethan England, as well as the twelve-day feast and Gloriana's

commissions to the knights, Dr. Spens considers a part of this assumed rearrangement. Finally, after appealing to the behaviour of the Red Cross Knight at the end of Book I and to the numbering of the fragmentary cantos of Mutability, she reaches the following decision: "The [original] poem was to consist of eight books of eight cantos each and Prince Arthur's quest of the Faerie Queene was its main theme. As the poem was a moral allegory the Faerie Queene must have been equivalent to the Good or the Heavenly Beauty, and Prince Arthur must be the soul. Seven of the books were to be devoted to the conquest of the seven Deadly Sins by the hero and the last was to describe Prince Arthur's realization of his vision." The proposed increase in the number of cantos, Dr. Spens thinks, "was probably partly effected, as in the case of *Paradise Lost*, by division of the existing cantos, but more was certainly done by padding."

These conclusions, it would seem, indirectly attribute to Spenser perfection in technical and architectonic ability, in sense of logic and chronology, and in poetic philosophy, far beyond any existing evidence. But even so, heterodox as they may be, the objection is not primarily to them as conclusions but to the rather naive assumption that the soritical process of arriving at them constitutes proof, as if by piling one hypothesis upon another, with "if," "apparently," "probably," one can literally create fact. A lattice-work of assumptions is no substitute for a chain of evidence even in a book that is avowedly but "an interpretation."

Spenser's repetition of narrative motifs indicates neither a paucity of ideas nor an infertility of design. Still less does the repetition of any single motif, or of an entire episode for that matter, serve as a sound basis for arguing a confusion of material or a change in philosophical outlook on the poet's part; nor, finally, does any repetition of motif or episode necessarily hint at an earlier draft or at a "hurried patchwork" for the whole poem of which they are a part. To contend that any such inconsistencies or discrepancies with, say, the letter to Raleigh are basic rather than superficial is to drag poetic genius into the law court and invalidate the testimony of formal poetic accomplishment because it differs from the poet's own informal testimony. Such sections of *The Faerie Queene* as the chronicle accounts, moreover, far from being afterthoughts, are a necessary part of the historical scaffolding of the poem; they relate unmistakably to Prince Arthur's quest, which is referred to in every

one of the six books, and are sufficient within themselves to belie a hasty revision in order to glorify Elizabeth. In its turn, to read into the numbering of the Mutability cantos evidence for a revision of *The Faerie Queene* is to be purely conjectural. No manuscripts have been discovered, and by what authority the cantos were numbered is unknown. Furthermore, is the story of Mutability, a spark off Fortune's wheel, brought to a conclusion? Do not IX, X, XI, XII follow VI, VII, VIII, even as I, II, III, IV, V precede them?

Spenser scholars will not object to the general implication of Dr. Spens's statement that *The Faerie Queene* is primarily a philosophical poem, but most of them will object to looking at the poem almost entirely from this point of view. The relationship of Spenser's ethics to sermon literature and his alleged structural use of the Seven Deadly Sins may be emphasized without arguing a "reconstruction" of *The Faerie Queene* "on the basis of Aristotle's *Ethics*." It is true that Spenser in the letter to Raleigh refers to the "twelue priuate morall vertues, as Aristotle hath deuised," but it is also true that therein, in respect to Prince Arthur, the poet speaks of magnificence "according to Aristotle and the rest." Surely, therefore, Spenser's references to Aristotle need not be misleading, for the qualification "and the rest" provides a key to the understanding of any system of philosophy that *The Faerie Queene* may embrace. Perhaps Dr. Spens herself, who in the second chapter ("The Philosophic Basis") takes pains to urge the influence of Plotinus on Spenser, is misled by the poet's references to Aristotle. In an age that was more than half mediæval, in an age that joined Gower and Lydgate with Chaucer as *the* triumvirate in English poetry, Aristotle was referred to in much the same way that Chaucer referred to Homer when he told a tale of Troy—or that Spenser himself in the same letter to Raleigh refers to Homer as the first of the "antique Poets historicall." Neo-Platonism or any other "ism" is not at variance with Aristotelian ethics to a Renaissance poet—or to any poet.

As for Prince Arthur's magnificence, Spenser makes it both a positive and a summary virtue (he so uses *magnanimity* interchangeably within the poem), Aristotle or no Aristotle. For all that we know and have right to assume, "Aristotle and the rest" includes Plato, Plotinus, and any other philosopher whom Spenser may have known. To him, magnificence, a primary virtue for the ruler of a state,

connoted among other things all that the Italian *magnificenza* implied—*The Faerie Queene* itself is dedicated to the "MAGNIFICENT EMPRESSE." It therefore matters not a whit whether Aristotle's all-comprehending moral virtue is the same, or whether Aristotle has one moral virtue or twelve or fourteen. In other words, Dr. Spens is too intent upon finding a consistent philosophical pattern in *The Faerie Queene* and, as a result, scrutinizes Spenser too much as poetic philosopher and not enough as philosophical poet.

The chief fault of Dr. Spens's book in the light of the author's professed purpose is the fact that it presents the philosophical significance of *The Faerie Queene* as of paramount schematic importance, and presents it unconvincingly. All that historical perspective has enabled us to see in Spenser's poem, regardless of what the Elizabethans may or may not have seen in it, is ignored. Ignored also is the proper relation of eclogue to epic in the Renaissance tradition and, in particular, the implication of Piers's words in the October eclogue of the *Calender* together with E.K.'s corresponding glosses and the very opening lines of *The Faerie Queene*. *The Faerie Queene* is an epic of chivalry, contradictory as such a literary type may seem, with a germinal, integral glorification, according to the established practice of the Renaissance epic, of Elizabeth and the House of Tudor. And Spenser, having inherited the stock of romance and the store of allegory, conceived of heroic poetry not simply as expression loftier than that afforded by the lowly eclogue but mainly as learned poetic utterance that includes more than it excludes. Thus it is that *The Faerie Queene* becomes a treatise of moral philosophy, a courtesy book, a manual of love, and much more than any art of poetry ever prescribed for the limits of an epic—a *speculum* of the Elizabethan heritage from the Middle Ages as well as of Tudor England and of contemporaneous Continental influences. To attempt to explain the full meaning of the poem from one point of view is impossible. Usually when Spenser is most didactic, he is most dull; but when he follows his true bent and wanders in a paradise of dainty devices, as his conception of the epic permits, he becomes the artist. This artistic side alone Dr. Spens is happy in portraying.

Perhaps the preface to Dr. Spens's book partially explains the author's difficulties, for it is not enough to recognize the existence of a corpus of recent Spenser scholarship and then somewhat idly disregard it and appeal to the court, or knock down the straw men,

of older scholarship that has had both its day and its night. The gap that has widened between the scholar and the critic since the eighteenth century must be closed. If the scholar needs the critic's sense of judgment, even more does the critic need the scholar's sense of fact.

C. BOWIE MILLICAN.

A Hamlet Bibliography and Reference Guide, 1877-1935.

By A. ADOLPH RAVEN. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1936. Pp. xvi+292. 16s. net.

THE plan of this book is well considered. It takes the year 1877 as its starting-point because in 1877 Dr. H. H. Furness' Variorum Edition appeared which contained the most complete *Hamlet* bibliography then available. It includes all writings published since then about *Hamlet* which have appeared as books, or distinct sections or essays in books, or in periodicals. It takes into consideration the more important editions of the play since the publication of Dr. Furness' work, and it does not omit to register the reviews of criticisms of *Hamlet*. Nor does it take the duties of a *Reference Guide* lightly. In fact, great part of its value consists in its careful and conscientious summaries in which according to the programme of the author "the statement of the conclusions of an author are regarded as more important than the outline of his argument, though wherever possible both are being given." It will further meet with general applause that the chapter on textual comments is "chronological under the lines or passages commented upon," *i.e.* that it starts with the first scene of the first act and ends with the second of the fifth. An admirable piece of painstaking and exact work has been done in this division which every future editor of the drama will feel grateful for. Nor have the wants of the literary critic been neglected. A special chapter divided according to the "characters" alleviates their task. The author himself refrains from any criticism; he has, however, starred "those items that seem to him to be the most important for the student and teacher," a very discreet and unobtrusive way of pronouncing his judgment. In such way a book has originated upon which the author as well as everybody who busies himself with *Hamlet* questions may be truly congratulated. It is not the author's fault that in spite of all his

thoroughness certain items remain out of his ken, such as, for example, prefaces to translations (cf. W. Keller, *Shakespeares Werke*, Berlin s.a. Bd. VI, S. 169-175). Printer's errors are rare: instead of Jespersen (1020) read: Jespersen. Hermann Conrad (821), by the way, did not "write under the pseudonym Hermann Isaac," but comparatively late in his life changed his name Isaac into Conrad.

LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING.

The Poems of Ben Jonson. Edited by BERNARD H. NEWDIGATE. Oxford. Published for the Shakespeare Head Press by Basil Blackwell. 1936. Pp. xxviii+400. 31s. 6d. net.

THIS beautifully printed volume worthily commemorates the tercentenary of Ben Jonson, who died on August 6, 1637, and who would have preferred to be remembered as a poet rather than as a playwright.

The Editor has wisely retained the spelling and punctuation of the original copies. The text of *Epigrammes*, *The Forrest*, and *Under-wood* is that of the folios. In the section entitled *Drift-wood* he has collected from printed and manuscript sources all the poems that can with certainty or probability be ascribed to Jonson, together with a few poems which, although the truth of the ascription is doubtful, traditional associations might lead a reader to expect. In this section, and in those entitled *Anthology* (lyrics and poems from the plays and masques), *Farrago* (a collection of epigrams, jests, and repartees attributed to Jonson by various writers and in various collections), and *Fronde Latinae*, the sources of the text are indicated at the foot of each poem.

The only defect of this otherwise admirable edition is a decided paucity of comment, which, with a writer of such vast allusiveness, such central and representative position, in whom so many literary currents, tendencies, and "influences" converge, might well have been fuller and more ambitious—something rather more like Professor Grierson's commentary on Donne.

In the explanation of names and personal allusions there is a somewhat illogical and haphazard division of labour between the "Notes on the Text" and the "Glossarial Index." For example, to understand the epigram on p. 172, beginning

That you have scene the pride, beheld the sport,
And all the games of Fortune, plaid at Court

it is absolutely necessary to know : (1) that the verses were addressed to John Williams, in 1621 ; (2) that Williams, having been from an early age a favourite of the King, from whom he had received numerous ecclesiastical preferments, might well be described as a courtier as well as a divine ; and (3) that in 1621, after Bacon's disgrace, Williams succeeded him as Lord Keeper, and was at the same time appointed to the see of Lincoln. Only fragments of this very necessary information are conveyed. From the Notes the reader merely learns that the poem is " Addressed to John Williams, appointed lord keeper 1621 ; deprived 1628," and from the Index that he was " divine ; bishop of Lincoln 1621 ; lord-keeper 1621." Again, in the notes on the ode *To the Immortal Memorie, And Friendship of . . . Sir Lucius Cary, And Sir H. Morison* there is no information about the friends, and there are only brief references in the Index. *Saguntum* is in the Index, but the reader will find nothing about its " Brave Infant."

It would have been well worth while to comment more fully on Jonson's many characteristic paraphrases, adaptations, and transmutations of passages in classical authors. The passage in the lines *To Sir Robert Wroth*, beginning

Let others watch in guiltie armes, and stand
The furie of a rash command

was obviously suggested by and partly imitated from the famous passage in the second *Georgic* (ll. 495 ff),

illum non populi fasces, non purpura regum, etc.

In the note on " Drinke to me, onley, with thine eyes " the various passages in the Epistles of Philostratus from which Jonson collected his phrases and conceits might well have been given in full, for this is surely the most interesting and elaborate of his transmutations. The note on the last line of the *Epode* (p. 73)

Man may securely sinne, but safely never

is most inadequate : " The passage derives from Seneca, ' Quid poena praesens . . . Salus aliqua tutum, nulla securum tulit.' " The lines quoted in this mangled and meaningless form occur in the *Hippolytus* (ll. 162-4), where the nurse is remonstrating with Phædra on her passion for Hippolytus :

Quid poena praesens, consciae mentis pavor,
Animusque culpa plenus et semet timens ?
Scelus aliqua tutum, nulla securum tulit.

" What of the immediate penalty—the terror of a guilty conscience,

a heart filled with crime and fearful of itself? Some women have sinned with safety, none with peace of mind." It is clear that Jonson had the whole passage in mind:

What savage, brute affection,
Would not be fearefull to offend a dame
Of this excellling frame?
Much more a noble, and right generous mind
(To vertuous moods inclin'd)
That knowes the waight of guilt: He will refraine
From thoughts of such a straine.
And to his sense object this sentence ever,
Man may securely sinne, but safely never.

If he had had "less Latin" one might be tempted to say that he had missed the point of it, for what the nurse says to Phædra is that woman may *safely* sin, but *securely* never—surely a profounder and more subtle observation than Jonson's.

In histories of literature Jonson, admirer and imitator of the classics, begetter of Herrick and Waller, is usually contrasted with Donne, despiler of imitation, metaphysical poet, begetter of Cowley. Nevertheless, a careful reader of Jonson will continually discover "another taste of wit," a distinct "metaphysical" strain that seems to have escaped the notice of historians. One might refer to *An Epistle to Master John Selden* (p. 111), with its compass metaphor reminiscent of Donne's; to *The Poet to the Painter* (p. 165), which contains the stanza

You were not tied, by any Painters Law
To square my Circle, I confesse; but draw
My Superficies: that was all you saw;

to the fourth poem in the series dedicated to the memory of Lady Venetia Digby, *The Mind* (p. 206), and to the ninth, *Elegie on My Muse* (p. 209), from which it seems worth while to quote a passage quite as metaphysical as Donne and as much in need of a commentary:

Indeed, she is not dead! but laid to sleepe
In earth, till the last *Trumpe* awake the *sheepe*
And *Goates* together, whither they must come
To heare their Judge, and his eternall doome;
To have that finall retribution,
Expected with the fleshes restitution.
For, as there are three *Natures*, *Schoolemen* call
One *corporall*, only; th' other *spirituall*,
Like single; so, there is a third, commixt,
Of *Body* and *Spirit* together, plac'd betwixt
Those other two; which must be judg'd, or crown'd:
This as it guilty is, or guiltlesse found,
Must come to take a sentence, by the sense
Of that great Evidence, the *Conscience*

From this it appears that Jonson, like Donne, was a psychopannychist, and perhaps the best commentary is a passage in one of Donne's Letters to the Countess of Bedford (Grierson, p. 197, ll. 57-8):

For, bodies shall from death redeemed bee,
Soules but preserv'd, not naturally free.

The reviewer hopes that he has now said enough to establish his contention that the whole duty of an editor of Jonson's poems cannot be said to have been fulfilled by the production of a sound text. Mr. Newdigate's notes are often excellent, but, as a whole, they are not nearly full enough. It is greatly to be hoped that the publisher may see his way to enable him to complete the good work he has begun, and to offer us a companion volume of disquisition and commentary.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

The Prose Works of Alexander Pope: Newly collected & edited by NORMAN AULT. Vol. I, The Earlier Works, 1711-1720. Oxford: Printed at the Shakespeare Head Press and published for the Press by Basil Blackwell. 1936. Pp. cxxvii+326. 3os. net.

IN *Pope's Own Miscellany*, 1935, Mr. Norman Ault claimed for Pope and added to the census of his writings between thirty and forty verse pieces hitherto unasccribed, and he has now turned to reclaim the strays of Pope's prose. The merits and demerits of his new volume are identical with those of the earlier work. In either instance by the exercise of greater restraint and a sounder realization of the limits of evidence he might have carried conviction further. As it is, the substantial and valuable contribution he has made to our better understanding of the secrets of Pope's literary byways is qualified by doubts which need not have been excited. The advocate can damage a good cause by forcing slender evidence too far. Let it be admitted, however, that if it is difficult to follow Mr. Ault throughout, to accept all his conclusions, or to rest with assurance upon every claim he makes, he has, by untiring industry, quickness of eye, and a remarkable memory produced an important work. He has much to say that is new, and he confirms accepted beliefs with additional proofs.

Pope as a writer of prose, save for his letters and a few prefaces,

hardly comes within common regard. His prose, furthermore, is anonymous to a greater degree than his verse. Only six of the forty pieces included by Mr. Ault in this volume were acknowledged by Pope on their publication, others he claimed later, others again were ascribed to him by contemporaries or by later scholarship; and to these Mr. Ault now adds eleven further pieces upon proofs set out at large in his introduction. All save two of Mr. Ault's identifications consist of papers contributed to *The Spectator* and *The Guardian*.

Pope was a minor contributor to both *The Spectator* and *The Guardian*, and eleven papers printed in these periodicals were acknowledged by him. Mr. Ault is fully justified in his effort to trace more than the two contributions to *The Spectator* acknowledged by editors, for Steele, by inference, ascribes to Pope a larger measure of assistance than would be compatible with so small a contribution; and Pope himself speaks of having written "a few Spectators" in addition to *The Messiah*. The proofs which Mr. Ault adduces for further *Spectator* ascriptions vary widely in weight and relevance. The letter contrasting a city and a country life, which appeared as part of *The Spectator*, No. 406, is unquestionably by Pope. The subject is one natural to him and handled in a manner reminiscent of his style. Further, as Mr. Ault points out, Pope included it later, with alterations, in editions of his correspondence, under the guise of a private letter to Steele. The unsigned letter introducing Pope's poem *On a Fan* (*The Spectator*, No. 527) is also, although editors have missed the fact, undoubtedly by Pope. In addition Mr. Ault makes out a good case for the two letters in Nos. 452 and 457, which put forward burlesque proposals for newspapers. Professor Sherburn (*The Early Career of Alexander Pope*, pp. 74-5), normally much more sceptical than Mr. Ault, thinks the letter in 457 is probably from Pope's hand, and if so the letter in 452 follows it, for Addison's introduction to 457 speaks of it as "written by the same hand." Seven other *Spectator* papers which Mr. Ault here prints as Pope's can hardly be accepted as more than conjectural attributions. The similarities of thought and phrase between these papers and Pope's acknowledged writings, which Mr. Ault adduces, are often remote and impress the reader more with admiration for his ingenuity and tenacity of memory than with any conviction that he has justified his new claims. It is interesting to see these papers printed together and to study arguments in their favour so

skilfully marshalled, but in the end we are left with no more than a doubtful possibility.

Mr. Ault prints as Pope's fourteen papers from *The Guardian*. Of these only eight are undeniably his. But, as Mr. Ault shows, there can be little doubt that he contributed more papers than these to Steele's periodical. On internal evidence Mr. Ault attributes *The Guardian*, No. 12, to Pope, but the proofs are meagre; and an equal doubt attaches to No. 15, which, stated to be by the same hand, stands or falls with it. The parallels with which Mr. Ault supports Pope's authorship of the letter "On the Origin of Letters" in No. 172 are of a general and indefinite character, and it is hardly possible to build on them more than a hesitant suspicion that the essay may be Pope's. A letter in No. 132, on the subject of sickness, is definitely shown to be by Pope; and it seems possible that No. 169, written in the same serious vein, at a time when we know Pope to have been ill, may be his, but there is no clear evidence to render impossible authorship by another hand. Mr. Ault is on surer ground with No. 11 and No. 106. The former, it is true, was given to Gay by Steele, but Warburton included it in his edition of Pope's *Works* and he has been followed by later editors. There seems, from internal evidence, to be every probability that the paper really is by Pope. A letter in No. 106 has much in common with *The Rape of the Lock*, and it was printed before *The Rape* had been published in its complete form. A common authorship of *The Guardian* paper and *The Rape* is more than probable.

An interesting problem is presented by the sixteen-page octavo pamphlet of 1711 entitled *The Critical Specimen*. This is an attack on Dennis, who had published an unmerciful review of the *Essay on Criticism*. Was *The Critical Specimen* Pope's rejoinder? Professor Sherburn (*op. cit.*, p. 94) finds "no sufficient evidence to determine the award of the pamphlet either to Pope or to any one of his friends." Mr. Ault, on the other hand, has little doubt of Pope's authorship, although he bases his contention, to a large extent, upon parallels between this piece and *The Narrative of Dr. Robert Norris*, 1713, a lampoon on Dennis for his adverse *Remarks* on Addison's *Cato*. But it is at least possible that *The Narrative* was not by Pope or that he only took part in a joint production, as Professor Sherburn inclines to believe (*op. cit.*, p. 111). There is, however, much to be said for Pope's authorship of *The Narrative*. Mr. Ault's discussion is well reasoned; he adds to our

knowledge of the circumstances surrounding its publication ; and he argues admirably from the probability of the occasion. Mr. Ault then proceeds to emphasize the improbability that Pope would have borrowed from *The Critical Specimen*, if it was another man's composition, and transferred to the later written *Narrative* gibes and similarities of phrasing directed to the same subject-matter. But for the reader who has no case to support these similarities are not wholly convincing. How far do they belong to the common object of ridicule—John Dennis and his idiosyncrasies ? There is a possibility in favour of Pope, but as Professor Sherburn concludes, " no sufficient evidence."

In *The Times Literary Supplement* for June 6, 1935, Mr. Ault put forward arguments for Pope's authorship of a burlesque sermon on *The Dignity, Use, and Abuse of Glass-Bottles*. His contention was questioned at the time by Mr. J. B. Sutherland and by Professor Sherburn. Mr. Ault here states his case again in further detail. The strongest argument he produces is a letter to Pope from Jervas dated June 12, 1715, in which he writes, after reference to Pope's *Farewell to London* and to his Homer, " I hear nothing of the Sermon—The Generality will take it for the Deanes and that will hurt neither you nor him." Following up this clue Mr. Ault traced a forgotten sermon-squib on glass bottles, which professes on its title-page to be " By the Author of the Tale of a Tub," and he has, further, discovered an advertisement announcing its publication for May 24, 1715. Mr. Ault argues from Jervas's letter that the reference can be to no other pamphlet and that Pope was the author. His statement of the evidence is brilliantly conducted, but is it decisive ? It is, at the least, not necessary to believe that because Jervas refers to two works by Pope the third reference is also to a piece from his hand. Mr. Ault argues that the sermon is by Pope and chiefly directed against Thomas Burnet and Horneke ; and to the suggestion that the sermon may be a defence of Pope by Gay, Arbuthnot, or some one else, he replies that no obvious connection with Pope is traceable. He cannot, however, have it both ways ; and on the assumption that Jervas's allusion is to this particular sermon, as seems likely, there is no unavoidable implication that Jervas thought of it as Pope's, while acknowledging, at the same time, on the evidence of the title-page, that the " Generality " would ascribe it to Swift. Furthermore, even if we are prepared to admit Pope's less attractive proclivities, it is difficult to believe that he

would have encouraged the reading public to assign to his friend, Swift, a lampoon as scurrilous and indecent as the sermon. Even Mr. Ault admits a real difficulty here. And the sermon is a laboured piece of work. If Pope wished to hit out, surely he could have written something better than this, and something more intelligible for the average reader? It may be added that the parallels Mr. Ault adduces are, with one exception, singularly weak.

Mr. Ault's account of the occasion and the relationship with Curll of *A Full and True Account*, *A Further Account*, and *A Strange but True Relation* is an admirable piece of work, and adds to our knowledge. He has been at great pains and sifted out new matter from the tangle of newspaper advertisements and pamphlets. The date of *A Further Account* has never been clearly determined. Mr. Ault suggests, and he seems to be right, that it was published at the end of November or beginning of December 1716. He has also succeeded in fixing within narrow limits the date of publication of *A Strange but True Relation*, although he has failed to trace a copy of the original pamphlet. It has been doubted whether it ever had a separate existence and whether or not its first appearance in print was in the Pope and Swift miscellany volume of 1732. Mr. Ault shows that it must have been published in separate form, and at some date between March 17 and April 12, 1720. And together with these pieces he makes out a good case for Pope's authorship of *God's Revenge against Punning*, also included in the 1732 volume of *Miscellanies*. Further, there can be little doubt that the anonymous squib, *The Plot Discover'd; or, a Clue to the Comedy of the Non-Juror*, ridiculing Cibber's partisan play, *The Non-Juror*, is by Pope. Professor Sherburn first drew attention to the likelihood of Pope's authorship, and Mr. Ault produces further evidence confirming Professor Sherburn's suggestion.

If few will find it easy to accept all the new ascriptions made by Mr. Ault, or accept as Pope's, with entire confidence, more than a fair proportion of the prose printed in this volume, no one will question the editor's gifts as an advocate and his power of close reasoning. Even if all that he sweeps into his net be not good fishing, much that is of value remains. He has retrieved what those who went before him missed, and he has illuminated the intricacies of pamphlet literature converging on Pope. The next volume, which will contain Pope's prose from 1721 to his death, is a book to await expectantly.

A few suggestions for the next volume may be forgiven. When manuscripts are mentioned, or rare pamphlets, should not some better indication of their whereabouts be given? Would it not be well to give page and volume references for citations and allusions? As it is the reader has to search for himself. A few footnotes explaining obscure allusions would be helpful.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Selected Bibliography. Compiled by VIRGINIA WADLOW KENNEDY, assisted by MARY NEILL BARTON. Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore. 1935. Pp. iv+151.

THIS is not a bibliography in the sense familiar to collectors of rare editions or to the members of a certain learned society. To those Druidic circles where water-marks are held at strange angles to the light, where the cancel-leaf is guarded as a sacred emblem, where incantations over imprints and colophons mingle with the groans of captive librarians, Miss Kennedy is a stranger. Her interest is modern and practical, ranging through "valuable new material," notes "frequently evaluative as well as descriptive," and "adequate information to facilitate the purchase of any item."

Of the several classes of workers for whom the book is intended, according to the Preface, some are more easily identified than others. The list of existing bibliographies is full and satisfactory, and will be useful to every class of worker except the elementary student; but the section devoted to "Selected Poems and Prose," consisting mainly of volumes "for use in schools and colleges, of selections from Coleridge and of anthologies of the period in print 1933-1934," is suited to the needs of the elementary student alone. One edition has "life, comment on poem, footnotes with questions"; another has "the minimum teaching apparatus"; in one "norms are included in the manual of directions furnished free to teachers"; one has "very brief notes, questions, and topics"; one is "for college use," another "for mature students," another "for second year high school." Even the kindergarten department is not forgotten, for an edition of the *Ancient Mariner* in the "New Pocket Classics" is said to have large print and a washable binding.

The class of worker whom we encounter in the section entitled

"Contemporaries" appears to combine the characteristic habits of the research student with the easy and accommodating temper of the general reader. In the latter capacity he will find an ample store, and may be expected to receive it with the placid and unresponsive contentment which he has never been known to vary. The research student also has every reason to be grateful, even if he should meet with an occasional disappointment. He is guided to all the recognized sources of biographical information and to everything of proved merit in contemporary criticism, including much that has been discovered or rediscovered by modern scholarship. The possibility of disappointment will arise if his demands are specific, as Miss Kennedy has foreseen. "That the section on contemporaries is not uniformly developed" is frankly admitted in the Preface, "so endless is the material and subject to personal preference."

The last remark is true if the test of admissibility is literary merit, historical importance, or distinguished authorship, but the disadvantage of such tests is that they exclude every need of the research student which lies beyond the domain of the general reader. It is doubtful whether a full list of every one of Hazlitt's articles having Coleridge's name in the title will be of much assistance even to the general reader. No author of the period has been more efficiently edited than Hazlitt, and a reader who cannot find his way through Waller and Glover's or Howe's edition, both of which are recorded, must be beyond the help of bibliographies. Hazlitt might well have spared one at least of his three pages to Jeffrey, who makes only a momentary appearance among a small crowd of "contemporaries not listed below whose memoirs, reminiscences, etc., give brief accounts of Coleridge." Most of Jeffrey's pronouncements on Coleridge occur in unexpected places—in articles on Crabbe, on Burns, on Southey, on John Wilson, on almost every poet of the time except Coleridge himself—and there is no Howe or Waller and Glover to assist in tracing them. Thomas Beddoes and Basil Montague, who share the slight notice accorded to Jeffrey, have just claims to greater prominence; and Joanna Baillie, Charles Lloyd, Robert Lovell, and C. R. Maturin deserve at least to be mentioned.

A certain preference for the line of least resistance, dimly discernible in this section, becomes clearly apparent in the section entitled "Criticisms." Here we meet the research student in his most serious mood, no longer to be diverted by the recreations of the general reader. "This list," says Miss Kennedy,

consists of a very small number of criticisms of Coleridge earlier than the publication of Haney's *Bibliography* of 1903, a somewhat larger number for the next ten years, and a much larger number for the period following the publication of lists in *Biographia epistolaris*, 1911, and the *Cambridge history of English literature*, Vol. II, 1914; and a far more comprehensive list from 1920, when the *Annual bibliography* began its invaluable work.

Though "a few studies by earlier critics have been included," they are intended only "to show the change in trend of judgment as well as in character of criticism."

To proceed in this way is to miss every opportunity of giving help where it is most needed. Even a beginner in research may be expected to have access to a library where the usual works of reference are available, and when he has discovered the *Annual Bibliography* and the *Year's Work in English Studies* he will have nothing to learn from a third recital of a twice-told tale. It would not be surprising if the "far more comprehensive list from 1920" should excite a mild form of the emotion expressed by Dr. Johnson on a famous occasion: "Is not a patron, my lord, one who looks with unconcern on a man struggling for life in the water, and when he has reached ground encumbers him with help?"

This criticism, it should be clearly stated, applies only to the part of the book which is designed for students who have made some progress in research. The teacher of elementary students will find everything he requires; so also will the general reader whose taste is not quite so general as to exclude a special interest in the genius of Coleridge.

P. L. CARVER.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

- ANGLIA, Band LXI. (Neue Folge XLIX.), Heft 3/4, June 1937—
 Harlekin. Germanischer Mythos in romanischer Wandlung (H. M. Flasdieck), pp. 225-340.
 Ae. *hrider*, *hriðdern* und *hriðdel* im Lichte altbritischer Entlehnungen (Max Förster), pp. 341-50.
 Altenglisches (W. Krogmann), pp. 351-60.
 Ae. *glemm*; *gewesan*; *eg(e)sa* (Gn. Ex. 107); *gangan* (Ps. 54, 13); *dȳst*, *dȳp*.
 The Offa-Constance Legend (A. H. Krappe), pp. 361-69.
 English Non-Dramatic Blank Verse in the Sixteenth Century (G. K. Smart), pp. 370-97.
 The Folio Text of Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* (Evelyn M. Simpson), pp. 398-415.
 Sir Walter Scott und die Geschichte (Max Korn), pp. 416-41.
 The Poetry of Emily Brontë (K. W. Maurer), pp. 442-48.
- ELH, Vol. IV., June 1937—
 The Purposeful Reading of Our Colonial Ancestors (L. B. Wright), pp. 85-111.
Ancrene Wisse vs. *Ancren Ritwe* (F. P. Magoun), pp. 112-13.
 The authority for the title.
 Rejected Q2 Readings in the New Shakespeare *Hamlet* (T. Pyles), pp. 114-46.
 Professor Dover Wilson's treatment of the text.
 Tom Brown and Elia (B. Boyce), pp. 147-50.
 Hunt, Hazlitt, and "Maga" (A. L. Strout), pp. 151-59.
- ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Band 71, Heft 3, June 1937—
 Das altgermanische Verbum Substantivum unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Altenglischen (H. M. Flasdieck), pp. 321-49.
 Henry Howard Earl of Northampton and Duelling in England (F. T. Bowers), pp. 350-55.
 New Light on Ben Jonson's *Discoveries* (A. T. Shillinglaw), pp. 356-59.
 Passage about Bacon in Hobbes's translation of Micanzio's letters.
 Carlyle's *Gropings about Montrose* (C. O. Parsons), pp. 360-71.
 MS. in the National Library of Scotland.
 Lafcadio Hearn: Dekadent? Aesthet? Exotist? (F. van Briessen), pp. 372-82.

- Zum Gebrauch der englischen Tempora (H. Koziol), pp. 383-92.
 Johnsonian Library in the University of Rochester (D. B. Gilchrist),
 pp. 436-37.
 Die Bedeutung des Ausdrucks *I don't think!* (K. Thielke), pp. 437-38.
 Wertungsbedingte Lautwandlungen im Neuenglischen (H. Koziol),
 p. 440.
 Note to article in previous number.

ENGLISH, Vol. I., No. 5, 1937—

- La Comtesse de Roussillon (Emile Legouis), pp. 399-404.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XIX., June 1937—

- The Verbs with Direct and Indirect Object Re-Examined (III.) (G.
 Kirchner), pp. 97-112.
 Vocabulary and Style of the Middle English *Ancrene Riwe* (N.
 Bøgholm), pp. 113-16.
 George Moore and his Friendship with W. B. Yeats (W. Gilomen),
 pp. 116-20.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES, Vol. I., May 1937—

- Essai sur le dernier roman de Charles Morgan: *Sparkenbroke* (L.
 Bonnerot), pp. 193-209.
 Du nouveau sur le *Journal à Stella* (E. Pons), pp. 210-29.
 Gabriel Sarrazin, critique de la poésie anglaise (G. Lafourcade),
 pp. 238-41.

July—

- Les débuts de Milton pamphlétaire (C. Looten), pp. 297-313.
 Tragic irony in Milton's *Samson Agonistes* (W. R. Parker), pp. 314-20.
 Une source de *Eastward Hoe*: Rabelais (A. J. Farmer), p. 325.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN, Band 171,
3 u. 4 Heft, June 1937—

- Zur Ineinanderbildung der verschiedenen Wurzeln und Formen im
 Präsens Indic. des verbum substantivum im Westgermanischen
 (F. Mezger), pp. 145-49.
 Beowulf-Epos und Aeneis in systematischer Vergleichung (A. Brandl),
 pp. 161-73.
 Chaucer, der Freund des einfachen Mannes (H. Marcus), pp. 174-82.
 Zu Lydgate, Troy Book, I. 591: "the fyry cat" (H. Koch), pp.
 207-10.
 Zur Textkritik von me. Genesis und Exodus (G. Linke), pp. 210-11.
 Lines 2675 ff. and 3206.
 Dickens und sein Verleger bei Erhöhung des Pickwick Honorars (A.
 Brandl), pp. 211-12.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY BULLETIN, No. 11, April 1937—

The Development of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (George B. Parks), pp. 1-11.

The confusion of place-names : possible explanations.

Wit's Bedlam of John Davies of Hereford (Lambert Ennis), pp. 13-21.

Edward May's Borrowings from Timothe Kendall and Others (Hoyt H. Hudson), pp. 23-58.

Richard Earl of Carbery's Advice to His Son (Virgil B. Heltzel), pp. 59-105.

The Great Mr. Locke : America's Philosopher, 1783-1861 (Merle Curti), pp. 107-51.

Extent and duration of Locke's influence in America.

A Schoolboy Tragedy at Winchester, ca. 1623 (H. H. Hudson), pp. 153-54.

Contemporary verse lament in Huntington MS. 116.

William Austin's "Notes" on *The Faerie Queene* (E. A. Strathmann), pp. 155-60.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXVI., April 1937—

Towards a Scientific Method of Textual Criticism for the Elizabethan Drama (H. T. Price), pp. 151-67.

Old and Middle English Notes (S. Einarsson), pp. 183-87.

Note on *dæg*=dawn ; O.E. *begæð* ; *all and some* ; M.E. *lake*.

Projected English Dictionaries, 1755-1828 (A. W. Read), pp. 188-205.

Tieck's English Studies at the University of Göttingen, 1792-94 (A. Gillies), pp. 206-23.

Arthur's Diamond Shield in the *Faerie Queene* (D. C. Allen), pp. 234-43.

Anglo-German Bibliography for 1936 (H. A. Pochmann), pp. 246-62.

LEEDS STUDIES IN ENGLISH AND KINDRED LANGUAGES, Number 5, 1936—

More Lost Literature in Old and Middle English (R. M. Wilson), pp. 1-49.

Alliterative Phrases in the *Ormulum* (E. S. Olszewska), pp. 50-67.

The Owl and the Nightingale and the S. William Window in York Minster (Bruce Dickins), pp. 68-70.

Note on *bataile inume*, l. 1197 : judicial combat.

Analogical Development of *-ing-* and the interpretation of Patrington (A. H. Smith), pp. 71-73.

LIBRARY, Vol. XVIII., June 1937—

The Company of Stationers before 1557 (G. Pollard), pp. 1-38.

A Renaissance Library : the Collection of John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester (R. J. Mitchell), pp. 67-83.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 499

Milton, Rothwell, and Simmons (W. R. Parker), pp. 89-103.

The printing and publishing of Milton's tracts.

Bibliographical Note on James Shirley's *The Polititian* (E. Huberman), pp. 104-08.

A newly discovered Issue of Scott's *The Vision of Don Roderick* (N. van Patten), pp. 109-13.

Variant of first edition.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. VI., June 1937—

New Light on the Text of the Alliterative *Morte Arthure* (E. V. Gordon and E. Vinaver), pp. 81-98.

Evidence of the Winchester MS. of Malory.

Malory's Story of Arthur's Roman Campaign (Tania Vorontzoff), pp. 99-121.

On Richard Rolle's Patrons: a new reading (E. J. Arnould), pp. 122-24.

A Note on *Pearl* and *The Buke of the Howlat* (Gavin Bone), pp. 169-70.

L. 140, *myrpes*.

Robert Talbot and *Domitian A. IX.* (C. E. Wright), pp. 170-71.

Writer of note on f. 11^v.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LII., June 1937—

Is Thomas de Quincey the Author of *The Love-Charm*? (H. K. Galinsky), pp. 389-94.

Evidence of Julius Hare's authorship.

"'Twill be Thine Another Day" (M. P. Tilley), pp. 394-97.

Note on *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV. i. 109.

Lycidas and the Translation of "May" (E. A. Strathmann), pp. 398-400.

Bathurst's Latin translation of the *Shepherd's Calendar*.

Did Spenser Starve? (Josephine W. Bennett), pp. 400-01.

Record of payment on December 30, 1598.

Notes on *Englands Parnassus* (F. B. Williams, Jr.), pp. 402-05.

Note on Fletcher and Massinger's *Little French Lawyer* (G. B. Evans), pp. 406-07.

Quotation from the *Tragedy of Nero*.

Julius Caesar and Elyot's *Governour* (D. Bush), pp. 407-08.

Scenery for *The Indian Queen* (T. B. Stroup), pp. 408-09.

Use in later plays.

"The Milder Shades of Purgatory" (J. S. Diekhoff), pp. 409-10.

Interpretation of Milton's phrase.

An Answer to Suckling's "Why so pale and wan, fond lover?" (G. F. Sensabaugh), pp. 410-11.

Marginal entry in a copy of *Aglaura*.

Some Early Verses by Chesterfield (C. Holsapple), p. 411.

Latin verses in *Gratulatio Academiae Cantabrigiensis* . . ., 1713.

- A Curious Blunder in some Modern English Translations of King Alfred's Version of Bede's History (J. M. McBryde), pp. 412-13.
 Force of " þū meahst mē singan " in the story of Caedmon.
 Gawain in the *Squire's Tale* (R. S. Loomis), pp. 413-14.
 Other references to the belief that Gawain was still in the land of Faerye.
 The Miller's Head (B. J. Whiting), pp. 417-19.
 Other hard-headed door-breakers.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXII., July 1937—

- " The Barbarous Metre of Barclay " (Fitzroy Pyle), pp. 353-73.
Deor : A Criticism and an Interpretation (F. Norman), pp. 374-81.
 A Poet in Chancery : Edward Benlowes (H. Jenkins), pp. 382-93.
 Business dealings with the Wrights and with John Schoren.
 Robert Gaguin and the English Poets, 1489-90 (H. L. R. Edwards), pp. 430-34.
 Seneca's Fatalism and Elizabethan Tragedy (C. F. Beckingham), pp. 434-38.
 A Stage Direction in the New Shakespeare *Hamlet* (C. Narayana Menon), pp. 438-41.
Hamlet, II. ii. 158.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. XXII., Part 4—

- The Text of the Old English Translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* (P. N. U. Harting), pp. 281-302.
 Relative authority of the MSS.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 172, May 1, 1937—

- A Third Thousand Notes on *N.E.D.* (G. G. Loane), pp. 314-15.
 Continued May 15, pp. 348-49 ; May 29, pp. 380-83 ; June 12, pp. 422-24 ; June 26, pp. 452-55 ; Vol. 173, July 10, pp. 21-24 ; July 24, pp. 64-66.
- May 8—
 On Three Passages of Shakespeare (H. W. Crundell), pp. 331-32.
1 Henry IV, III. i, *Hamlet*, I. iv, and *Coriolanus*, IV. vii. 31-57.
- May 15—
 Allusions in Byron's Letters (R. G. Howarth), pp. 349-51.
 Sources found.
- May 22—
 The Bab Ballads by Titles (J. M. Bulloch), pp. 362-67.
 Bibliographical record.
 Dragon-guarded Treasure (St. Clair Baddeley), pp. 369-70.
 Gloucester field-name, Dragenhord.
- June 5—
 Some Contributions to English Dialects (W. Matthews), pp. 398-402.
 East Anglian, Bedford, and Kentish words.
 The Letters from Sir George Mackenzie to Evelyn (E. S. de Beer), pp. 402-03.
 Written in 1667/8, not 1666/7.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 172, June 19—

Allan Ramsay and the Scottish Archers (J. L. Weir), pp. 435-38.

Lycidas and Lycaeus (T. C. C.), p. 447.

Echoes of Virgil's Eclogues. Note by T. O. Mabbott, June 26, p. 462.

Vol. 173, July 10—

On Rossetti's "Jenny" (R. G. Howarth), pp. 20-21.

Textual history.

July 17—

The Literary Value of Snails (Hibernicus), pp. 38-41.

Snails in description and imagery. Further note by F. Bradbury, July 31, p. 83.

July 24—

Milton's "Proposals of Certain Expedients," 1659 (T. O. Mabbott and J. M. French), p. 66.

Essay in MS. in Columbia University Library.

July 31—

Trollope misquoting Virgil (W. H. J.), p. 79.

Note on *Phineas Redux*.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XVI., April 1937—

Joseph Addison's Letters to Joshua Dawson (W. Graham), pp. 97-104.

Importance of the series formerly in Irish Record Office, and authenticity of extant copies.

Foreign Performers in the London Theaters in the Early Eighteenth Century (E. L. Avery), pp. 105-23.

The Hauptmann *Hamlet* (F. B. Wahr), pp. 124-38.

"Misogyny" in Milton's *Samson Agonistes* (W. R. Parker), pp. 139-44.

Unfairness of the allegation.

William Wycherley's *Miscellany Poems* (H. P. Vincent), pp. 145-48.

Difficulties and delays in publication.

English Literature, 1660-1800: A Current Bibliography (L. I. Bredvold), pp. 149-91.

The Unifying Influence of Love in Keats's Poetry (T. B. Haber), pp. 192-209.

Notes on the Contemporary Popularity of Defoe's *Review* (C. E. Burch), pp. 210-13.

King Oswald's Death in Old English Alliterative Verse (Fr. Klaeber), p. 214.

Evidence of a lost poem?

The Last Eighteenth-Century Performance of Wycherley's *The Country Wife* (F. F. Seeley), pp. 217-18.

November 7, 1753.

"Let Gryll be Gryll" (R. E. Parker), pp. 218-19.

Faerie Queene, Book II, and analogue in Calvin's *Institutio Christianae Religionis*.

Dr. Thomas Birch as Transcriber of Johnson (R. W. Babcock),
pp. 220-21.

Source of notes in B.M. Addit. MS. 4254, No. 99.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Vol. LII., June 1937—

Spenser's *Rosalind*: A Conjecture (T. H. Banks), pp. 335-37.

His wife in 1580?

Spenser with Lord Grey in Ireland (R. Jenkins), pp. 338-53.

Thirty-four additional documents in Spenser's hand.

The Rhetoric of Donne's Sermons (H. H. Umbach), pp. 354-58.

Notes on Three of Fielding's Plays (C. B. Woods), pp. 359-73.

The Letter-Writers, The Modern Husband, and Eurydice Hiss'd.

The Metrical Tale in XVIII-Century England (J. W. Draper), pp. 390-97.

The Irish Background of Goldsmith's Social and Political Thought
(R. W. Seitz), pp. 405-11.

Walton's *Lives* and Gillman's *Life of Coleridge* (B. R. McElderry, Jr.),
pp. 412-22.

Hogg and *The Necessity of Atheism* (F. L. Jones), pp. 423-26.

Hogg as probable author of a first draft.

James Hogg's Forgotten Satire, *John Paterson's Mare* (A. L. Strout),
pp. 427-60.

In *The Newcastle Magazine*, IV, January 1825.

The Waverley Novels, or a Hundred Years After (P. Landis), pp. 461-73.

Victorian Comment on Russian Realism (C. Decker), pp. 542-49.

SPECULUM, Vol. XII., July 1937—

Chaucer and Peter Riga (Karl Young), pp. 299-303.

The Style of the *Beowulf*: A Study of the Composition of the Poem
(C. C. Batchelor), pp. 330-42.

A Christian composition.

Vincent of Beauvais and Chaucer's Cleopatra and Croesus (W. K.
Wimsatt, Jr.), pp. 375-81.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXIV., April 1937—

Spenser and the Italian Myth of Locality (R. B. Gottfried), pp. 107-25.
Spenser's stories of Mulla and Molanna.

Swooning in the *Faerie Queene* (Zaidee E. Green), pp. 126-33.

Spenser on the Regiment of Women: A Note on the *Faerie Queene*,
V. v. 25 (Kerby Neill), pp. 134-37.

Spenser and Mediaeval Mazers; with a note on Jason in Ivory (Rose-
mond Tuve), pp. 138-47.

The August eclogue; the gates of the Bower of Blisse.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 503

- Samuel Daniel in France and Italy (M. Eccles), pp. 148-67.
 Evidence of identity.
 The Date of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (L. Kirschbaum), pp. 168-75.
 Evidence in favour of 1601.
 The Occasion of *King Lear* (J. W. Draper), pp. 176-85.
 Propaganda in favour of the Union?
 Richard Johnson's Borrowed Tears (F. B. Williams, Jr.), pp. 186-90.
Anglorum Lacrimae, 1603, and Rogers' *Celestiall Elegies of the Goddesses*, 1598.
 Commentaries on Genesis as a Basis for Hexaemeral Material in the Literature of the Late Renaissance (A. Williams), pp. 191-208.
 The Astronomy of *Paradise Lost* (G. McColley), pp. 209-47.
 Recent Literature of the English Renaissance (Hardin Craig, D. Patrick, and W. Wells), pp. 260-382.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. VXXIV., July—

- Ben Jonson the Actor (F. T. Bowers), pp. 392-406.
 Charles Johnson's *The Force of Friendship and Love in a Chest: A Note on Tragi-comedy and Licensing in 1710* (E. N. Hooker), pp. 407-11.
 Evidence of the original manuscript prompt-copy.
 Cato's Obscure Counterpart in *The British Journal*, 1722-25 (P. B. Anderson), pp. 412-28.
 Bernard Mandeville's journalistic activities.
 Wordsworth's Relation to Coleridge's *Osorio* (Marie P. Hamilton), pp. 429-37.
Ruth as a sequel to *The Foster Mother's Tale*.
 Carlyle's Fusion of Poetry, History, and Religion by 1834 (Hill Shine), pp. 438-66.
 The Sources of Browning's *Sordello* (S. W. Holmes), pp. 467-96.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, March 13, 1937—

- The Revenger's Tragedy* (C. S. Napier), p. 188.
 Suggested emendation in last scene.

— March 20—

- Lockhart's *Life of Scott: A Plea for Revision* (W. M. Parker), p. 210.
 Lamb's Doctor (E. V. Lucas), p. 222.
 J. V. Asbury.
 A Forged Shelley Letter (Sylva Norman), p. 222.
 Letter to Mary, December 15 or 16, 1816. Reply, maintaining authenticity, by S. de Ricci, March 27, p. 240. Rejoinder by S. Norman, April 3, p. 256; by S. de Ricci, April 10, p. 275; by G. Pollard, April 17, p. 292; by S. de Ricci and T. Besterman, April 24, p. 308; by G. Pollard, May 8, p. 364; by M. Kessel, May 29, p. 412; by S. Norman, June 5, p. 428.
The Kingis Quair (Angus Macdonald), p. 222.
 King James' authorship.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, March 27—

Joseph Hall (A. Davenport), p. 240.

Parallels with the prefatory poem to *Work for Chimney-sweepers*. Reply by S. H. Atkins, April 3, p. 256; note by R. J. Kane, June 12, p. 447; by S. H. Atkins, June 26, p. 480.

— April 3—

Fielding's Danish Translator: Simon Charles Stanley the Sculptor (Mrs. Esdaile), p. 252.

Notes by B. Rackham and Mrs. Esdaile, April 17, p. 292.

Shadwell 1658-68 (C. E. Ward), p. 256.

References in the Pells Rolls; date of his marriage.

John Gibson visits William Blake (S. A. Larrabee), p. 256.

Reference in Gibson's autobiography.

A Shakespearian Pun? (A. F. Pollard), p. 256.

Note on *Henry V*, Act v, Prologue, l. 44.

— April 10—

The Voice of Swinburne: A Singer's Conquest—and After, pp. 261-62.

Note by V. C. Turnbull, April 17, p. 292.

Contrive or Continue (R. W. Chapman), p. 275.

Further examples of confusion in print.

— April 17—

Dryden's Conversion: The Struggle for Faith, pp. 281-82.

Master Richard Castyr (Dorothy Jones), p. 292.

Author of poem in Lambeth MS. 853.

— April 24—

The Historian and "The Gibbon," pp. 297-98.

Croker and Tennyson (H. J. C. Grierson), p. 308.

Proof of Croker's authorship of review of 1833.

— May 8—

Charles Lamb Again (E. V. Lucas), p. 364.

Verses for an Album, 1833.

Poems by Mrs. Behn (A. Mizener), p. 364.

To George, Duke of Buckingham, in 1715 edition of his Works.

"Stoic Fur" (C. W. B.), p. 364.

Note on *Comus*, and other Miltoniana.

The Ettrick Shepherd (Davidson Cook), p. 364.

Bibliographical note.

"The Rash Conjurer" (Edith J. Morley), p. 364.

Reference in Crabb Robinson's Diary of August 20, 1812.

— May 15—

The Family of Izaak Walton (A. M. Coon), p. 380.

Biographical details.

George Turberville (Norma H. Hodgson), p. 380.

Brother, not son, of Nicholas Turberville.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 22—

Skelton at Diss (H. L. R. Edwards), p. 396.

Skelton's satiric epitaphs.

Donne's Satires (S. H. Atkins), p. 396.

Evidence for date 1596-7. Note by G. B. Harrison, giving further evidence, May 29, p. 412.

The Ring and the Book (B. R. McElderry, Jr.), p. 400.

Unnoted contemporary reviews.

— May 29—

Coleridge on Slang (B. Ifor Evans), p. 412.

Marginalia in a copy of translations by Jeremy Collier.

— June 5—

Marlowe and his Father (Ethel Seaton), p. 428.

References in the Harriot papers probably not to Christopher Marlowe.

William Habington (J. M. Nosworthy), p. 428.

Date of his marriage.

— June 12—

The Spanish Tragedy Additions (L. L. Schücking), p. 442.

Supplementary note, June 19, p. 464. Reply by F. S. Boas, June 26, p. 480; by L. L. Schücking, July 17, p. 528.

A Lamb Mystification (E. Blunden), p. 447.

Source of the "Serenata" on Cowden Clarke's marriage.

Two Sonnets of Keats (F. Neiman), p. 447.

Sonnet on Fame published in *The Odd Fellow*, 1842. Note by M. B. Forman on earlier publication, June 19, p. 464.

R. J. Kane, p. 447.

"Cadwallader" (A. W. Baldwin), p. 447.

Disputing evidence of William Harbert's authorship. Note by N. G. Brett-James, giving further evidence, June 19, p. 464.

— June 19—

Swift and Stella (T. P. C. Kirkpatrick), p. 464.

The illegality of the alleged marriage.

— June 26—

Barrie as Dramatist: A Divided Mind, pp. 469-70.

— July 3—

Elizabethan Decoration: Patterns in Art and Passion, pp. 485-86.

John Donne the Astronomer: The Date of the Eighth Problem (I. A. Shapiro), p. 492.

Note by W. Fraser Mitchell, July 10, p. 512. Reply by I. A. Shapiro, July 17, p. 528. Note by J. Lindsay, July 24, p. 544; by P. Legouis, July 31, p. 560.

"Puzzling Names" in Blake (Piloan Nanavutty), p. 496.

Possible connection with Indian thought. Note by M. E. Perugini, July 10, p. 512; by J. Lindsay, July 24, p. 544.

Hardy and Hudson (A. E. Burke), p. 496.

"The Darkling Thrush" and a passage in *Nature in Downland*.

Master Holofernes (G. M. Young), p. 496.

Verses inscribed on portrait of Sir Edward Monyns.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, July 10—

Augustan Age (K. L. Joshi), p. 512.

Use of term in 1726 in reference to the age of Queen Anne.

Milton, Leigh and Dunkin (T. O. Mabbott), p. 512.

Identity of the "little scribbling quack" mentioned by Edward Phillips.

A Letter from Claire Clairmont (F. L. Jones), p. 512.

Writer of letter of June 3, 1819, attributed to Amelia Curran.

July 17—

A New Fragment of Keats (H. W. Garrod), p. 528.

Source of fragment printed by Miss Hewlett.

A Shelley Letter (F. L. Jones), p. 528.

Exact date of letter of 1820 to Mrs. Gisborne.

Concealed Verse in Pope's Prose (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 528.

The Waverleys in French: Scott's authorship revealed in 1822
(Davidson Cook), p. 532.

Note by F. D. Evans, July 24, p. 548.

July 24—

Lord Chesterfield (Sheila Radice), p. 544.

Further biographical notes: I, Mademoiselle du Bouchet. II, James Hammond and others, July 31, p. 560.

Chapman's Method (G. G. Loane), p. 544.

His version of the opening lines of the *Iliad*.

July 31—

Dickens's *The Battle of Life* (A. G. Schaw Miller), p. 564.

The four issues of the first edition.

**WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY STUDIES: III. Philological Papers, Vol. 2,
May 1937—**

Little Musgrave and Lady Barnard (Helen P. Pettigrew), pp. 8-19.

American versions of the ballad, and two unpublished West Virginia texts.

Leigh Hunt and his wife Marianne (J. P. Brawner), pp. 25-31.

A defence of Marianne Hunt.

The Realism of the Merry Wives (Eleanor J. Haller), pp. 32-38.

The Prince-Philosopher and Shakespeare's Hamlet (J. W. Draper),
pp. 39-43.

Hamlet not a philosopher.

Rochester's *Satire against Mankind*: A Study of Certain Aspects of
the Background (S. F. Crocker), pp. 57-73.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1937

B.A. with Honours in English Language and Literature.

BELFAST.—English Literature :

Class III.—Margaret K. Nicholas.

BIRMINGHAM.—English :

Class II.—Div. 1 : Marion R. Frampton, Joyce Griffith, Claudia E. L. Land, Brenda E. Walker. *Div. 2* : Alice Fletcher, F. J. Hill, Kathleen M. Titley.

Ægotat.—R. H. Grimes.

BRISTOL.—English :

Class I.—Marian D. Gibbs.

Class II.—Div. 1 : Sylvia P. Chappell, Celia M. Cody, Phyllis J. Collins, J. Powell, S. R. Prosser, Kathleen M. Thomas. *Div. 2* : Marian Broadhead, Muriel Hollway, Joyce H. B. Jones, F. Kenworthy, Jean McWilliam, J. A. Watkins.

Class III.—A. C. Martin, A. C. Walker.

CAMBRIDGE.—English Tripos, Part I :

Class I.—M. J. C. Hodgart (Pemb.), G. Horne (Christ's), G. A. Peck (Cath.), J. A. E. Smart (Emm.), I. P. Watt (Joh.), C. H. Wilson (Jes.).

Class II.—Div. 1 : J. S. Abraham (Down.), G. H. Bantock (Emm.) J. S. Bell (Down.), C. H. Cook (Cath.), D. W. Doughty (Cath.), G. B. Ewart (Christ's), G. G. Gentle (Cath.), R. D. Hunter (Trin. H.), D. L. Syme (Cath.), F. S. Whitehead (Fitzw.). *Div. 2* : K. R. Beeching (Down.), D. S. Bland (Emm.), A. F. Buttery (Christ's), S. P. Chapman (Down.), F. J. A. Clark (Sid. Suss.), D. W. Greenwood (Christ's), H. G. Hancox (Cath.), J. N. Hewitson (Christ's), N. W. Higgin (Sid. Suss.), R. R. Kenefeck (Down.), J. S. Maples (Down.), F. Moorby (Down.), P. P. Neumark (Trin.), D. E. Plim (King's), H. E. Poole (Trin. H.), A. W. Price (Fitzw.), F. W. Scott (Cath.), D. W. Tattersall (Emm.), H. Thannhauser (Trin. H.), W. A. Thornton (Emm.), W. E. Walton (Cath.), J. G. Warry (Queens').

Class III.—M. S. Allwood (Fitzw.), S. M. Barratt (Selw.), I. R. Bell (Cai.), A. Bithell (Selw.), J. Burns (Fitzw.), G. E. Chippington (Christ's), R. C. Churchill (Down.), H. W. Coxon (Queens'), R. B. Darewski (Cla.), D. A. Edwards (Trin. H.), J. H. Edwards (Queens'), V. M. Halsted (Emm.), I. H. Hay (Jes.), P. E. C. Hayman (Joh.), P. N. Hume (Queens'), C. Jaffa (Queens'), E. R. L. Lewis (Trin. H.), J. C. W. Lewis (Joh.),

D. T. Llewellyn (Trin.), J. D. R. McConnell (Cla.), D. F. R. Mallows (Christ's), R. H. B. Mason (Christ's), T. H. L. Parker (Emm.), M. R. S. Philips (Cai.), J. M. Phipps (Emm.), E. S. Rowlands (Cath.), E. W. Scott (Joh.), J. C. H. Stocks (Emm.), R. V. Symonds (Joh.), T. R. Thompson (Jes.), C. L. Walters (Jes.), J. N. White (Christ's), J. A. Whyte (Fitzw.), R. T. Widdows (Cla.), T. G. Wilson (Joh.), A. D. Winterburn (Emm.), F. W. Wood (Pet.).

WOMEN

Class II.—Div. 1 : E. L. Arnott (Girton), A. A. J. Henderson (Girton), C. Hopkinson (Newn.), E. K. Laycock (Newn.), J. Zinkin (Girton). *Div. 2* : R. G. Bookless (Newn.), S. M. V. Bushell (Newn.), T. G. Mayor (Newn.), M. A. Preston (Girton), S. C. Priest (Newn.), M. Richardson (Newn.), P. M. Sheppard (Newn.), M. Stockwood (Girton), U. Y. Tann (Newn.), M. C. Townley (Newn.).

Class III.—B. M. G. Butler (Girton), V. C. Kemp (Newn.), J. B. Scatchard (Girton), E. Shoenberg (Newn.).

PART II

Class I.—C. L. Barber (Cath.), T. R. M. Creighton (Trin.), A. C. Kettle (Pemb.), G. H. Phelps (Fitzw.), J. C. A. Roper (Cai.), G. Steedman (Selw.).

Class II.—Div. 1 : M. E. Burrows (Cai.), A. A. Bushnaq (Jes.), V. A. Cox (Jes.), P. Ellison (Down.), T. S. Turner (Pet.), M. Whiffen (Pet.), R. R. Wright (Fitzw.). *Div. 2* : A. J. Andrews (Down.), A. Aronson (Fitzw.), V. H. Bhanot (Fitzw.), D. P. Clifford (King's), A. A. Dent (Corp. Chr.), I. Macaulay (Pemb.), H. H. Malherbe (Cai.), M. T. Owen (Fitzw.), M. Pratap (Fitzw.), I. R. Salmond (Jes.), H. R. Thomas (Fitzw.).

Class III.—H. le F. Burrow (Magd.), A. F. Daw (Magd.), R. P. Graham (Fitzw.), A. C. Jarvis (Fitzw.).

WOMEN

Class I.—H. Hammond (Girton), Y. R. C. Koster (Newn.), R. M. Macdonald (Girton).

Class II.—Div. 1 : R. Beresford (Newn.), E. Bustin (Girton), E. S. Fraser (Girton), H. M. Liddle (Newn.), M. A. Lister (Girton), M. B. Macaulay (Girton), D. A. Mikellatos (Newn.), F. M. Nicholson (Newn.), E. M. Statham (Girton), R. H. Syfret (Girton), M. F. Wade (Newn.). *Div. 2* : H. R. Dupré (Girton), M. C. Redmond (Newn.), M. Rolt-Wheeler (Girton), E. K. Thomas (Girton), M. P. S. Wood (Newn.).

Class III.—P. E. Bacon (Newn.).

DURHAM.—English :

Class I.—Pearl Wilkinson (St. Mary's).

Class II.—Div. 1 : Helen E. Bellingham (St. Hild's), W. H. Cooke (Hatf.), Marguerite J. Gascoigne (Arms.), Betty Y. Harker (St. Mary's), Herbert R. Lacey (Univ.), Katharine A. McLeish (Arms.), Cecily Potts

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1937 509

(St. Mary's), J. L. Robson (Arms.), Inez I. Scott (St. Mary's). *Div. 2 :* R. L. Best (Bede), J. Davey (Arms.), S. N. Pearson (Arms.), Marian Tait (N. Cross), E. J. Titt (Non.), Dorothy M. Yeoman (Arms.).

Class III.—J. Fulton (St. John's), Constance C. Stewart (Arms.), C. W. Watson (Arms.).

LEEDS.—English :

Class I.—Irene M. Bower, Azuba J. Weldon.

Class II.—Margaret Barton, H. Beckett, Ruth E. Findlay, P. A. Gaffney, Olivia Harland, Mary A. Hayes, Eileen Kershaw, D. Marshall, Winifred Oxley, J. L. Seymour, Alianore Whytlaw-Eray.

Class III.—Norah Smith.

LIVERPOOL.—English :

Class II.—*Div. 1 :* Myfanwy G. Jones, J. B. Mays, S. M. Rush. *Div. 2 :* Mabel E. Crewdson, Mary R. Humble.

LONDON (Internal).—English :

Class I.—M. Dodderidge (King's), Ella M. Gibson (Holloway), R. G. Holloway (U. C.), Winifred S. Hyde (King's), Hannah G. Melton (Bedford), J. A. Sheard (King's), Barbara M. H. Smith (King's), R. L. Smith (King's), W. H. Wood (U. C.).

Class II.—*Div. 1 :* G. W. Canham (King's), Mollie G. Canning (Westfield), Minnie A. Christopher (U. C.), J. A. Clark (Q. M. C.), Grace M. Clay (U. C. and Bedford), G. J. Copley (King's), Doris V. Cox (King's), Elizabeth C. Crawley (Westfield), H. Cunnington (U. C.), A. C. D. Ingram (U. C.), Margaret Isaacs (King's), T. A. Jefferson (U. C.), Katharine H. Knight (Holloway), Phyllis M. P. Langley (Holloway), Nellie K. Mercer (Holloway), D. C. Miller (U. C.), L. M. Mitchell (King's), B. J. Murtough (U. C.), Lorna M. Rainbow (Bedford), Joan E. Richardson (Holloway), C. W. Sharman (U. C.), Hazel J. Smith (Q. M. C.), Dorothy I. Stewart (Bedford), W. A. J. Taft (King's), Joan M. Thomas (Westfield), Dorothy K. Watkins (King's), K. Watson (Birkbeck), J. G. Weller (King's). *Div. 2 :* Maud E. Ady (Birkbeck), Joan Amos (Holloway), Margaret Bellamy (Holloway), Lily K. Bottrill (Westfield), Sylvia M. Brown (King's), Lilian G. Chandler (King's), Florence B. M. Dobbs (U. C.), Ellen M. French (King's), Gwendoline M. Jones (Westfield), Edmonde London (U. C.), Mary M. McAuley (U. C.), Norah M. McKenna (King's), Agnes M. McLaren (Bedford), Kathleen M. B. McNeill (U. C.), A. L. McTiffin (U. C.), Jean M. Menzies (Q. M. C.), Nina E. K. Mogg (Westfield), F. A. Naughton (King's), Dorothy M. Partridge (Bedford), Cora McM. Pollock (U. C.), Molly C. Potter (Bedford), J. Reading (U. C. and Birkbeck), R. V. Rosetti (King's), C. C. Sheldrake (King's), H. C. Swift (Birkbeck), Beryl J. Viner (U. C.), Joan Webber (U. C.), Agnes J. Wilton (Westfield).

Class III.—Barbara E. H. Baines (Bedford), Janet M. Cozens (King's), E. R. Edmonds (King's), Phyllis Feldman (U. C.), Margaret Haffenden (King's), Irene W. Hall (Bedford), Eileen G. Hassell (Bedford), Dorothy

A. Heffernan (King's and Birkbeck), Marcia Hobbes (King's), Marie Looms (King's), Phyllis Marsden (King's), S. J. Roddan (King's), Joan M. Scopes (Bedford), Alice M. Smyth (King's), W. A. C. Stewart (U. C.), A. J. Townsend (King's), E. J. C. West (King's).

LONDON (External).—English :

Class I.—Marjorie A. Culley (Priv.), J. D. Roberts (Brighton Tech. Coll.), G. G. Urwin (U. C. Hull).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Ida M. Beck (U. C. Hull), D. Billany (U. C. Hull), G. H. Brinkworth (Priv.), V. J. Coupe (U. C. Hull), Gwendoline N. Frisby (Priv.), J. B. Miller (U. C. Nott.), Enid M. Robotham (Priv.), E. A. Slade (U. C. Ex.), Elisabeth F. Stallard (U. C. South.), Monica Tebbs (U. C. Nott.), W. Wallace (Priv.), F. Walsham (Priv.), K. O. Williams (Priv.). *Div. 2* : A. J. Allen (Priv.), Joan Alport (U. C. Hull), Ruth B. Barlow (U. C. South.), F. Barnes (Priv.), W. Boynes (U. C. Hull), Patricia M. Cowan (Priv.), Frances L. Hollis (Convent of the Sacred Heart Maidstone), W. Howgate (U. C. Hull), Grace L. Hunt (U. C. South.), Terese K. M. Hurley (U. C. South.), A. MacP. Kinnear (Portsmouth M. C.), J. F. Ladkin (U. C. Leic.), Eileen M. Leach (U. C. South.), J. D. E. Lister (U. C. Nott.), Isabel J. Little (Priv.), J. W. Lloyd (Portsmouth M. C. and Priv.), F. Martin (Priv.), A. D. Nicolson (Priv.), Joan D. Selby (U. C. Hull), Joan E. Shipp (U. C. Hull), Hilda S. Sims (U. C. Ex.), Joan E. Withey (U. C. Ex.).

Class III.—Margaret E. Barnes (St. Stephen's Coll. Folkestone) Valeria M. Catlin (Priv.), Lona Davies (U. C. Ex.), Marjorie E. Groom (U. C. Nott.), Hilda M. Jones (U. C. Nott.), Harriet Leadbetter (Priv.), W. J. Le Blanc (Priv.), J. T. Lumsden (U. C. Nott.), Daisy G. I. Stevenson (U. C. Nott.), Helen E. Taylor (U. C. South.).

MANCHESTER.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—H. A. Jones, Jill Symons.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : K. R. Gray, L. R. Halliday, W. Haworth, A. Merrall, Elizabeth Oddie, Vivien M. Snow, J. Swallow. *Div. 2* : J. Atkinson, J. L. Godwin, Marjorie Lowe, Margaret M. Oakes, Kathleen R. Turner, Elizabeth A. Webster, Annie E. Wood.

OXFORD.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—K. R. Brooks (Mert.), E. J. Dobson (Mert.), C. J. Horne (Ball.), D. V. Le Pan (Mert.), Winifred M. Fox (St. Hug.), Dorothy M. Whitehead (H.-S.).

Class II.—A. C. Bailey (St. Edm. Hall), W. Bebbington (Mert.), J. S. Bishop (St. John's), G. J. Cronin (Hertf.), A. C. Davies (New), W. H. Dunlop (Oriol.), E. L. Edmonds (Univ.), J. J. Espey (Mert.), C. B. Freeman (Oriol.), S. R. Gibbs (St. Peter's), J. V. Greenlaw (Mert.), C. P. Hanna (Exeter), A. Lennox-Short (Chr. Ch.), D. I. Masson (Mert.), W. H. Mitchell (St. Edm. Hall), J. A. Nichols (Queen's), A. W. Rablen (St. John's), R. J. H. C. Ross (Ball.), G. S. Sayer (Magd.), A. P. L. Slater (St. Edm. Hall), P. H. Sparks (Mert.), J. R. Wheeler (Mert.), W. D.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1937 511

Woodgate (Pemb.), D. Wynn (St. John's), B. M. G. Young (Exeter), J. C. Young (St. Cath.), Elizabeth D. Aitken (L. M. H.), Margaret E. Atkinson (H.-S.), Isobel J. Ballatine (St. Hild.), Marion R. Bascom (H.-S.), Ida Bates (St. Hild.), Hilary B. Brett-Smith (Som.), Weston Blanche R. B. Dillon (St. Hild.), Nora M. Dixon (St. Hild.), Eira T. Downs (St. Hild.), Hilda M. Frame (Som.), Catherine A. Gaminara (St. Hug.), Pamela O. E. Gradon (L. M. H.), Joan V. Lipson (Som.), Lucille I. Parks (St. Hug.), Angela H. Petter (St. Hild.), Mary M. Pheasant (H.-S.), Stella B. S. Pigrome (H.-S.), Margaret M. Rosenthal (L. M. H.), Ruth E. Taylor (St. Hug.), Urith M. Trevelyan (Som.), Marjorie M. B. Werner (Som.), Freda B. White (St. Hild.), Margaret W. Whiteley (L. M. H.), Joan M. Yeaxlee (St. Hug.).

Class III.—A. H. Barker (St. Peter's), J. N. Burdess (Oriol.), J. P. Burrough (St. Edm. Hall), A. S. K. Cook (St. Cath.), B. Herbert (St. Cath.), W. G. Hurlow (St. John's), T. G. H. Jones (Chr. Ch.), B. E. C. Lewis (St. Peter's), R. J. Lund (St. Edm. Hall), G. J. Padmanabha (St. Cath.), H. M. Pollard (Wadh.), H. I. Salt (St. Cath.), I. W. Scott (Hertf.), P. C. Sood (Oriol.), T. M. Steele (Oriol.), J. C. Stephenson (St. Edm. Hall), A. N. M. Thomson (Exeter), R. S. Todd (Queen's), C. W. Turner (St. Cath.), J. Usborne (Ball.), R. P. P. Wardlaw (Mert.), A. T. de B. Wilmot (St. Edm. Hall), Joan M. Baldwin (L. M. H.), Lena G. Barnett (L. M. H.), Katherine J. Barris (L. M. H.), Noreen M. Comerford (St. Hild.), Aalish M. Gawne (L. M. H.), Hilda Y. Handy (H.-S.), Mary A. Hoover (H.-S.), Grace E. S. Hunt (St. Hug.), Margaret Ingram (H.-S.), Audrey C. Jackson (Som.), Rita A. Kerr (St. Hild.), Frances Lakin (H.-S.), Patricia H. McGregor (St. Hug.), Eileen M. McKenna (St. Hild.), Eileen B. Mackinlay (St. Hug.), Emily Meir (L. M. H.), Margaret A. Nicolson (L. M. H.), Dorothea M. Paterson (St. Hild.), Georgiana Remer (H.-S.), Elaine W. Reynolds (St. Hug.), Mary V. Royds (H.-S.), Marie E. Ryall (St. Hug.), Fenella E. Saintsbury (St. Hug.), Doris M. Thornton (St. Hug.), Avice V. Turnbull (Som.), Ethel J. Walsh (L. M. H.), Winifred Wetherall (H.-S.), Patricia B. Williams (L. M. H.).

Class IV.—G. K. Booth (Pemb.), J. C. Coleman (St. Cath.), I. C. M. Conner (Keble), G. Cullinan (Worc.), P. Davison (Exeter), G. H. D. Greene (Magd.), H. St. J. M. Gullett (Oriol.), J. J. McShea (St. Cath.), E. H. Patey (Hertf.), P. K. Peirson (Worc.), Margaret E. Frost (Som.), Margarita M. Lyon (H.-S.), Dora L. G. M. Patey (H.-S.), Margery Shaw (Som.), Joyce B. Smith (H.-S.).

READING.—English :

Class I.—Emma A. H. Clifford.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Violet M. Richardson. *Div. 2* : Margaret Garton.

Class III.—G. Halliday, Nora M. Roper.

SHEFFIELD.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—G. E. Morris.

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Aileen Button, J. C. Suffolk.

Class III.—Edith Smith.

WALES.—English :

Class I.—J. O. Ainley (Ban.), H. Evans (Aber.), Audrey E. R. Jenkins (Card.), S. Jones (Card.), F. C. Markwell (Card.), E. G. McGregor (Card.), W. M. Meredith (Aber.), J. M. Scofield (Ban.), Winifred M. Smith (Card.), L. G. Taylor (Swan.), T. W. Thomas (Swan.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : Edith K. Boobyer (Card.), J. R. Britton (Card.), Annie E. Bufton (Card.), Irene E. Dash (Card.), H. M. Davies (Swan.), Beryl K. Day (Card.), Morfudd E. D. Hughes (Aber.), Mary C. Jones (Aber.), Hazel M. M. Kennedy (Card.), E. A. Lewis (Card.), C. J. L. Price (Swan.), Iris Prosser (Card.), Mary F. Rees (Card.), Ann Roberts (Aber.), Nancy M. Seaton (Aber.), D. J. Shott (Card.), Betty Thomas (Swan.), Eirlys Thomas (Aber.), R. G. Thomas (Card.), I. M. Williams (Aber.). *Div. 2* : H. M. Davies (Swan.), D. R. Hammond (Card.), Gwladys M. Jones (Card.), Gwilym I. Michael (Ban.), L. G. Morgan (Swan.), O. A. Morris (Aber.), W. E. Morris (Card.), F. J. Neate (Card.), Rhiannon S. Roberts (Aber.), W. T. Rowlands (Card.), Irene S. Thomas (Ban.), K. B. Thomas (Swan.), Marjorie P. B. Thomas (Aber.), H. Williams (Ban.), H. S. Winter (Swan.).

Class III.—D. M. Bradshaw (Card.).

SCOTLAND (M.A.)

ABERDEEN.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—Dorothy B. Gordon.

Class II.—Anne MacKenzie, K. McL. McRobb, L. D. Wiseman.

Class III.—C. B. Edie, M. W. Geary, G. D. Runcie, Margaret J. Wright.

EDINBURGH.—English :

Class I.—G. I. Duthie, D. J. Gordon, M. H. Higgins.

Class II.—D. H. M. Davies, S. C. Hood, A. McB. Mackay, D. S. Petrie, Jessie M. Scott, E. B. Thomson, Marie A. Valerio, Elizabeth M. Wallace.

Class III.—Agnes E. Murphie, Louisa N. E. Sinclair.

ERRATUM

P. 137, n. 1, and p. 138, n. 1, for November 17 read November 23.

INDEX

- Aldgate, The Old Joiner of*, see George Chapman.
- Allen, N. B., his *Sources of John Dryden's Comedies* reviewed, 356
- Alliterative phrases, list of, 221
- Alliterative Poetry in Middle English*, by J. P. Oakden, reviewed, 217
- Antichrist, The Play of, from the Chester Cycle*, ed. W. W. Greg, reviewed, 341
- Antony and Cleopatra*, Garrick's presentation of, 20; Capell's text of, 25
- Appreciation of Poetry, The*, by P. Gurrey, noticed, 117
- Assonance, Frequency of, in R. Tofte's works, 405
- Aubrey, J., and R. Hooke, 213
- Ault, N., his ed. of *The Prose Works of Alexander Pope* reviewed, 488
- Bacon, F., note by C. F. Beckingham on parallel passages in Bacon and Fuller, 449
- Bateson, F. W., review by, 117
- Beckingham, C. F., note on parallel passages in Bacon and Fuller, 449
- Behrendsohn, W. A., his *Zur Vorgeschichte des "Beowulf"* reviewed, 464
- Bennett, R. E., note on tracts from John Donne's library, 333
- Beowulf*, note by K. Malone on the burning of Heorot, 462; *Beowulf and the Seventh Century: Language and Content*, by R. Girvan, reviewed, 464; *Zur Vorgeschichte des "Beowulf"*, by W. A. Behrendsohn, reviewed, 464
- Bergen, H., his *Lydgate's Troy Book* reviewed, 473
- Boas, F. S., his ed. of *The Diary of Thomas Crosfield* reviewed, 103
- Bodleian Library, see *Catalogue of English Newspapers, 1622-1680*.
- Bolton, Edmund, imprisoned for recusancy, 396
- Bonnard, G. A., note on Lamb's *Samuel Salt* and Mrs. Milman's *Mr. S—te*, 80
- Bradbrook, M. C., her *Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy* reviewed, 94
- Breton, John, d. 1559, his will, 136
- Browning Handbook, A*, by W. C. de Vane, reviewed, 373
- Buckingham 1592-1628*, by M. A. Gibb, reviewed, 92
- Bühler, C. F., article on *London Thow art the Flowre of Cytes all*, 1; review by, 473
- Bunyan, John, Mechanick Preacher*, by W. Y. Tindall, reviewed, 104
- Burns, R.: *Robert Burns. His Personality, His Reputation and his Art*, by F. B. Snyder, reviewed, 373
- Byrom, H. J., review by, 96
- Capell, E., his alteration of *Antony and Cleopatra*, 25
- Cardinals, lives of, by R. Tofte, 413
- Carols, The Early English*, by R. L. Greene, reviewed, 85
- Carver, P. L., reviews by, 243
- Catalogue of English Newspapers, 1622-1800, in the Bodleian Library*, reviewed, 359
- Ceylon not Milton's "Taprobane," 209
- Chambers, Sir E. K., his *Sir Henry Lee: An Elizabethan Portrait* reviewed, 225
- Chapman, George, his lost play *The Old Joiner of Aldgate*, 230
- Chapman, R. W., article on *Johnson's Letters*, 139
- Chaucer, G., note by P. E. Dustoor on Chaucer's use of *Discreet*, 206
- Chester Plays, see *Antichrist*
- Civet-cats, see Defoe.
- Clark, W. S., article on *Corpses, Concealments, and Curtains on the Restoration Stage*, 438

- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor : *A Selected Bibliography*, compiled by Virginia W. Kennedy, reviewed, 493
- Conquest of China by the Tartars, The*, a play by Sir Robert Howard, 455
- Corpses, Concealments, and Curtains on the Restoration Stage*, article by W. S. Clark, 438
- Craigie, Sir W. A., his *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (Part VI) reviewed, 245
- Crosfield, Thomas, *The Diary of*, ed. F. S. Boas, reviewed, 103
- Cross, Richard, prompter at Drury Lane, 1756, 24
- Darbishire, Helen, review by, 111
- David, R., his *Janus of Poets : Being an Essay on the Dramatic Value of Shakespeare's Poetry both good and bad* reviewed, 354
- Defoe, Daniel, article by T. F. M. Newton on *The Civet-cats of Newington Green : New Light on Defoe*, 10; *Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes*, by R. Stamm, reviewed, 232
- De Quincey, Thomas*, by H. A. Eaton, reviewed, 238
- Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue, A*, Part VI, by Sir W. A. Craigie, reviewed, 245
- Diodati, J., note by Sylvia L. England on the site of Diodati's house, 73
- Discreet*, Chaucer's use of, 206
- Donne, J., note, by R. E. Bennett, on tracts from his library, 333
- Drayton, M., article on *The Language of Drayton's Shepherds Garland*, by Kathleen Tillotson, 272
- Dreiden, Mr., mentioned in 1663, question of identity with the poet, 299
- Dryden, John, *Some Notes on Dryden*, by C. E. Ward, 297; note by R. G. Ham on Dryden's Epilogue to *The Rival Ladies*, 1664, 76; his loan to Charles II, 297; *The Sources of John Dryden's Comedies*, by N. B. Allen, reviewed, 356
- Dryden, John, jr., songs in his play *The Husband his own Cuckold*, 303
- Dunbar, William, his authorship of *London Thow art the Flowre*, 5
- Dustoor, P. E., note on Chaucer's use of *Discreet*, 206
- Eaton, H. A., his *Thomas De Quincey : A Biography* reviewed, 238
- Eccles, M., article on *Jonson and the Spies*, 385
- Eighteenth century, vulgarisms in the speech of, 307; *The Neo-Classic Theory of Tragedy in England during the Eighteenth Century*, by C. C. Green, reviewed, 365; *The Sublime : A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England*, by S. H. Monk, reviewed, 366
- Elizabethan printing: licensing of books, see *Licenser*.
- Elizabethan Tragedy, Themes and Conventions of*, by M. C. Bradbrook, reviewed, 94
- Ellis-Fermor, Una M., reviews by, 94, 100
- Elphinston, James, works on English Pronunciation, 1765-90, by, 309
- England, Sylvia L., note on the site of Diodati's house, 73
- England's Helicon* (1600, 1614), by H. E. Rollins, reviewed, 96
- Erasmus, the English version of his *Precatio Dominica*, 257
- Evelyn, J., and R. Hooke, 214
- Faust, G. P., his *Sir Degare : A Study of the Texts and Narrative* reviewed, 470
- Fencing match in *Hamlet*, a note on the, by A. A. Gay, 326
- Fool's Fortune*, a jig, 230
- Ford, John, by M. Joan Sergeaut, reviewed, 100
- Forman, M. B., his ed. of *The Letters of John Keats* (2nd ed.) reviewed, 111
- Fuller, T., note by C. F. Beckingham on parallel passages in Bacon and Fuller, 449
- Garrick's Presentation of "*Antony and Cleopatra*," article by G. W. Stone, 20
- Gardner, Edmund Garratt, 12 May, 1869-27 July, 1935, noticed, 377

- Gascoigne, George, article by Genevieve A. Oldfield on *New Light on the Life of George Gascoigne*, 129; his "disinheritance" and marriage, 129; his *Hundreth Sundry Flowres* not an anthology by various writers, 131
- Gay, A. A., note on the fencing match in *Hamlet*, 326
- Gee, J. A., article on *Margaret Roper's English version of Erasmus' "Precatio Dominica" and the Apprenticeship behind Early Tudor translation*, 257
- German, C. Saint, *see* Saint German.
- Gibb, M. A., his *Buckingham 1592-1628* reviewed, 92
- Girvan, R., his *Beowulf and the Seventh Century* reviewed, 464
- Glaphorne, H., his *Revenge for Honour*, 425
- Gollancz, Sir Israel, his ed. of *The Quatrefoil of Love* reviewed, 374
- Grattan, J. H. G., his ed. of *The Owl and the Nightingale* reviewed, 467
- Gray, Thomas, *The Correspondence of*, ed. by P. Toynbee and L. Whibley, reviewed, 361
- Green, C. C., his *Neo-Classic Theory of Tragedy in England during the Eighteenth Century* reviewed, 365
- Greene, R. L., his *Early English Carols* reviewed, 85
- Greg, W. W., article on *From Manuscript to Print*, 190; his ed. of *The Play of Antichrist from the Chester Cycle* reviewed, 341; reply to review, 352; his *Calculus of Variants*, 343; review by, 85
- Griffin, W. J., note on an omission in the Folio text of *Richard III*, 329
- Griffiths, Olive M., her *Religion and Learning: A Study in English Presbyterian Thought from the Bartholomew Ejections (1622) to the Foundation of the Unitarian Movement* reviewed, 109
- Gurrey, P., his *Appreciation of Poetry* noticed, 117
- Ham, R. G., note on Dryden's Epilogue to *The Rival Ladies*, 1664, 76; review by, 356
- Hamlet*, note on the fencing match in, by A. A. Gay, 326; *Der Sinn des Hamlet* reviewed, 91
- Häusermann, H. W., review by, 232
- Havelok the Dane*, l. 1,917, note by G. V. Smithers, 458
- Henry VI, Parts 2 and 3*, and the "Bad Quartos," 64
- Heorot, *see* *Beowulf*.
- Higden, Henry, and John Dryden, 305
- Hind and the Panther, The*, Origin of the milk-white hind in, 300
- Hoffman, H. L., his *Odyssey of the Soul: Shelley's Alastor* reviewed, 243
- Hogg, James, and Wilson's *Noctes Ambrosianae*, 46, 177; his General Knowledge, 49; his Knowledge of English Literature, 54; his Knowledge of the Classics, 177
- Hogrefe, Pearl, article on *Life of Christopher Saint German*, 398
- Holland, Hugh, imprisoned for recusancy, 396
- Hooke, Robert, and his literary contemporaries, note by Margaret Wattie, 212
- Howard, Sir Robert, and Lord Rochester, 455
- Husbands, Winifred, her *Summary of Periodical Literature*, 118, 247, 378, 496
- Imitation, *see* *Plagiarism*.
- Isle of Dogs, The*, and Jonson's imprisonment, 389
- Italy in English Literature, 1755-1815*, by R. Marshall, reviewed, 373
- Janus of Poets, The*, by R. David, reviewed, 354
- Johnson, S., article by R. W. Chapman on *Johnson's Letters*, 139
- Jones, The Revd. Robert, Letters from Wordsworth to, 39
- Jonson, Ben, *Jonson and the Spies*, article by M. Eccles, 385; cause of his imprisonment under Elizabeth, 389; his catholicism, 392; *The Poems of Ben Jonson*, ed. B. H. Newdigate, reviewed, 485

- Keats, John, edition of his *Letters* by M. B. Forman (2nd ed.) reviewed, 111
- Keep the Widow Waking*, a lost play by Dekker and others, 230
- Kennedy, Virginia W., her *Samuel Taylor Coleridge: A Selected Bibliography* reviewed, 493
- King, R. W., review by, 238
- Kirschbaum, L., note on the Elizabethan licenser of "copy" and his fee, 453
- Lamb, C., note on his reference to *Samuel Salt* and Mrs. Milman's *Mr. S—te*, by G. A. Bonnard, 80
- Latin, methods of teaching in early sixteenth century, 266
- Lee, Sir Henry: *An Elizabethan Portrait*, by E. K. Chambers, reviewed, 225
- Leishman, J. B., reviews by, 91, 485
- Lewis, C. S., his *Allegory of Love: A Study in Medieval Tradition* reviewed, 477
- Licenser, the Elizabethan, of "copy," and his fee, note by L. Kirschbaum, 453
- London Thow art the Flowre of Cytes all*, article by C. F. Bühler, 1
- Love, *The Allegory of: A Study in Medieval Tradition* reviewed, 477
- Lowe, Solomon, his *Critical Spelling Book*, 1770, 308
- Lydgate's Troy Book*, ed. H. Bergen, reviewed, 473
- Macgregor, D. C., reviews by, 90, 104, 373
- McKerrow, R. B., *A Note on the "Bad Quartos" of 2 and 3 Henry VI and the Folio Text*, 64
- Maclean, Catherine M., review by, 113
- Malone, K., note on the burning of Heorot, 462
- Marshall, R., his *Italy in English Literature, 1755-1815*, reviewed, 373
- Matthews, W., article on *Some Eighteenth-Century Vulgarisms*, 307; review by, 116
- Mawer, Sir A., review by, 245
- Metre, see Assonance.
- Michael and Frances*, a jig, 230
- Middle English, *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English*, by J. P. Oakden, reviewed, 217
- Milford, R. T., his *Catalogue of English Newspapers and Periodicals in the Bodleian Library, 1622-1800*, reviewed, 359
- Millican, C. B., review by, 479
- Milman, Mrs. (alias Phillips), her *Apology*, 81
- Milton, J., note by G. C. Moore Smith on his *Art of Logic*, 335; note by G. W. Whiting on *Taprobane* and the sources of Milton's geographical knowledge, 209
- Monk, S. H., his *The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England* reviewed, 366
- Montague, Lady Mary Wortley, C. Lamb's reference to, concerning S. Salt, or S. Shirley, 80, 82
- Morgan, Pierpont, Library, MS. of *London Thow art the Flowre* in, 8
- Nares, R., his *General Rules for Pronunciation*, 1792, 310
- Newdigate, B. H., his ed. of *The Poems of Ben Jonson* reviewed, 485
- Newspapers, *A Catalogue of English Newspapers and Periodicals in the Bodleian Library, 1622-1800*, by R. T. Milford and D. M. Sutherland, reviewed, 359
- Newton, T. F. M., article on *The Civet-cats of Newington Green: New Light on Defoe*, 10
- Noble, R., his *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer as Exemplified in the Plays of the First Folio* reviewed, 90
- "*Noctes Ambrosianae*," *The*, and James Hogg, article by A. L. Strout, 46
- Oakden, J. P., his *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English: A survey of the traditions* reviewed, 217
- Odyssey of the Soul, An: Shelley's Alastor*, by H. L. Hoffman, reviewed, 243
- Oldfield, Genevieve A., article on *New Light on the Life of George Gascoigne*, 129

- Old Joiner of Aldgate, The*, a lost play by Chapman, 230
- Owl and the Nightingale, The*, ed. J. H. G. Grattan and G. F. H. Sykes, reviewed, 467
- Parrat or Parrot, spy, identity of, 387
- Parrott, T. M., his *William Shakespeare: A Handbook* reviewed, 354
- Peerson, Martin, imprisoned for recusancy, 396
- Pepys, Samuel, and Robert Hooke, 214
- Periodicals, *see* Newspapers.
- Pinto, V. de S., his *Rochester: Portrait of a Restoration Poet* reviewed, 358; reviews by, 92, 109
- Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance*, by H. O. White, reviewed, 88
- Plague, certificates of freedom from, issued in Italy in 1593, 288
- Poley, Robert, spy, and Jonson, 385, 390
- Pope, A., *The Prose Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. N. Ault, reviewed, 488
- Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries*, by P. Simpson, reviewed, 190
- Quatrefoil of Love, The*, ed. Sir Israel Gollancz and Magdalene M. Weale, reviewed, 374
- Quintana, R., his *Mind and Art of Jonathan Swift* reviewed, 235
- Raven, A. A., his *A Hamlet Bibliographical and Reference Guide, 1877-1935*, reviewed, 484
- Religion and Learning: A Study in English Presbyterian Thought from the Bartholomew Ejections (1662) to the Foundation of the Unitarian Movement*, by Olive M. Griffiths, reviewed, 109
- Renaissance, *The: Plagiarism and Imitation during the English Renaissance*, by H. O. White, reviewed, 88
- Restoration, Stage of the, 438
- "*Revenge for Honour*": *Date, Authorship, and Sources*, article by J. H. Walter, 425
- Rhymes, frequency of assonance in place of rhyme in work of R. Tofte, 405
- Richard III*, note on an omission in the Folio text of, 329
- Rival Ladies*, Dryden's, the name "Honoria" in, 300
- Rochester, John Wilmot, Earl of: *The dating of Rochester's "Scaen,"* note by H. H. Wilson, 455; *Rochester: Portrait of a Restoration Poet*, by V. de S. Pinto, reviewed, 358
- Rollins, H. E., his *England's Helicon (1600, 1614)* reviewed, 96
- Roper, Margaret, *Margaret Roper's English version of Erasmus' "Precatio Dominica" and the Apprenticeship behind Early Tudor translation*, article by J. A. Gee, 257
- Saint German, Christopher, Life of*, article by Pearl Hogrefe, 398
- Salt, Samuel, Lamb's reference to, 80
- Salter, F. M., review by, 341
- Saviolo, Vincentio, his *Practise (1595)* partly translated from Muzzio, *Il Duello (1558)*, 327
- Saxe, J., his *Bernard Shaw's Phonetics* reviewed, 116
- Scandinavia, *see* *Seventeenth Century*
- Schücking, L. L., his *Der Sinn des Hamlet: Kunstwerk-Handlung-Überlieferung* reviewed, 91; review by, 484
- Scottish Tongue, A Dictionary of the Older*, Part VI, by Sir W. A. Craigie, reviewed, 245
- Seaton, Ethel, her *Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century* reviewed, 106
- Sergeant, M. Joan, her *John Ford* reviewed, 100
- Seventeenth Century, Literary Relations of England and Scandinavia in the*, by Ethel Seaton, reviewed, 106
- Shakespeare, W., article by G. W. Stone on Garrick's presentation of *Antony and Cleopatra*, 20; note by R. B. McKerrow on 2 and 3 *Henry VI* and the "Bad Quartos," 64; note by A. A. Gay on the fencing match in *Hamlet*, 326; note by W. J. Griffin on an omission in the Folio text of *Richard III*, 329; *A Hamlet Bibliographical and Reference Guide, 1877-1935*, by A. A. Raven, reviewed,

- 484; *The Janus of Poets*, by R. David, reviewed, 354; *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age*, by C. J. Sisson, reviewed, 229; *Shakespeare and the Audience*, by A. C. Sprague, reviewed, 354; *Shakespeare's Biblical Knowledge and Use of the Book of Common Prayer as Exemplified in the Plays of the First Folio*, by R. Noble, reviewed, 90; *Der Sinn des Hamlet*, by L. L. Schücking, reviewed, 91; *William Shakespeare: A Handbook*, by T. M. Parrott, reviewed, 354
- Sharp, Granville, *A Short Treatise on the English Tongue*, 1767, 308
- Shaw, Bernard, *Bernard Shaw's Phonetics*, by J. Saxe, reviewed, 116
- Shelley, P. B., *An Odyssey of the Soul: Shelley's Alastor*, by H. L. Hoffman, reviewed, 243
- Simpson, P., his *Proof-Reading in the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries* reviewed, 190
- Sir Degare: A Study of the Texts and Narrative Structure*, by G. P. Faust, reviewed, 470
- Sisson, C. J., his *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age* reviewed, 229
- Smith, G. C. Moore, note on Milton's *Art of Logic*, 335
- Smithers, G. V., note on *Havelok the Dane*, l. 1,917, 458; reviews by, 217, 467, 470
- Snyder, F. B., his *Robert Burns* reviewed, 373
- Spencer, Gabriel, actor, 392
- Spens, Janet, her *Spenser's Faerie Queene: An Interpretation* reviewed, 479
- Spenser, Edmund, imitation of his archaisms by Drayton, 272; words from his *Shepheards Calendar* in Drayton's *Shepheards Garland*, 275; *Spenser's Faerie Queene*, by Janet Spens, reviewed, 479
- Sperry, W. L., his *Wordsworth's Anticlimax* reviewed, 113
- Sprague, A. C., his *Shakespeare and the Audience: A Study in the Technique of Exposition* reviewed, 354
- Stage, The, of the Restoration, the traverse, etc., 438
- Stamm, R., his *Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes* reviewed, 232
- Stone, G. W., Jr., article on Garrick's Presentation of "Antony and Cleopatra," 20
- Strout, A. L., article on *The "Noctes Ambrosianae" and James Hogg*, 46
- Sublime, *The: A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England*, by S. H. Monk, reviewed, 366
- Sumatra, called Taprobane by Milton, 209
- Sutherland, D. M., his *Catalogue of English Newspapers and Periodicals in the Bodleian Library, 1622-1800*, reviewed, 359
- Sutherland, J. R., reviews by, 359, 365
- Swift, J., *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift*, by H. Teerink, reviewed, 366
- Swift, J., *The Mind and Art of Jonathan Swift*, by R. Quintana, reviewed, 235
- Sykes, G. F. H., his ed. of *The Owl and the Nightingale* reviewed, 467
- Taprobane in *Paradise Regained*, 209
- Teerink, H., his *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Jonathan Swift* reviewed, 366
- Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy*, by M. C. Bradbrook, reviewed, 94
- Throckmorton family, The, 401
- Tillotson, A., reviews by, 103, 358, 361, 366
- Tillotson, G., review by, 354
- Tillotson, Kathleen, article on *The Language of Drayton's "Shepheards Garland"*, 272; review by, 477
- Robert Tofte, article by F. B. Williams, Jr., 282, 405
- Tindall, W. Y., his *John Bunyan, Mechanick Preacher* reviewed, 104
- Tonson, Jacob, suit between him and Henry Higden, 350
- Toynbee, P., his ed. of *The Correspondence of Thomas Gray* reviewed, 361
- Tracts from John Donne's library, a note by R. E. Bennett, 333
- Translation, use of in teaching Latin in early sixteenth century, 261
- Traverse, see Stage.

Troy Book, see *Lydgate's Troy Book*.

Tuffley, Joan, Defoe's mother-in-law,
13

University Examination Results, 1937,
507

Vane, W. C. de, his *Browning Hand-
book* reviewed, 373

Virgil, Dryden's translation of, agree-
ment for, 301; advertisement concern-
ing subscriptions, 304

Vulgarisms, Some Eighteenth-Century,
article by W. Matthews, 307

Walker, Alice, reviews by, 88, 225, 229

Walker, James, his *Critical Pronouncing
Dictionary*, 1791, 309

Walter, J. H., article on "Revenge for
Honour": *Date, Authorship, and
Sources*, 425

Ward, C. E., *Some Notes on Dryden* by,
297

Wattie, Margaret, note on Robert
Hooke and his literary contemporaries, 212

Weale, Magdalene M., her ed. of *The
Quatrefoil of Love* reviewed, 374

Whibley, L., his ed. of *The Correspond-
ence of Thomas Gray* reviewed, 36

White, H. O., his *Plagiarism and
Imitation during the English Renais-
sance* reviewed, 88

Whiting, G. W., note on Milton's
Taprobane, 209

Williams, F. B., Jr., article on *Robert
Tofte*, 282, 405

Williams H., reviews by, 235, 366, 488

Wilson, H. H., note on the dating of
Rochester's "Scaen," 455

Wilson, John, article by A. Y. Strout on
his *Noctes Ambrosianæ* and James
Hogg, 46

Women, writings by, in England before
1523, 261

Wordsworth, W., article by H. G.
Wright on *Two Letters from Words-
worth to Robert Jones*, 39; *Words-
worth's Anti-Climax*, by W. L.
Sperry, reviewed, 113

Wrenn, C. L., reviews by, 374, 464

Wright H. G., article on *Two Letters
from Wordsworth to Robert Jones*,
39; review by, 106

Yeomans, John, *The Abecedarian*,
1759, 307